School of Theology at Claremont
1001 1378765

The Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY AT CLAREMONT

WEST FOOTHILL AT COLLEGE AVENUE
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA

Highways to International Good Will

JX
1953
V3

By

WALTER W. VAN KIRK

Associate Secretary, Commission on International Justice and Good Will of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.

THE ABINGDON PRESS

NEW YORK CINCINNATI CHICAGO

Copyright, 1930, by
WALTER W. VAN KIRK

All rights reserved, including that of translation into foreign languages, including the Scandinavian.

Printed in the United States of America

The Bible text printed in this publication is taken from the American Standard Edition of the Revised Bible, copyright, 1929, by the International Council of Religious Education, and is used by permission.

THIS VOLUME
IS DEDICATED TO
MARCIA
WITH THE PRAYER THAT SHE AND
ALL OTHER LITTLE CHILDREN OF THE WORLD MAY
NEVER KNOW THE BITTERNESS
AND TRAGEDY OF WAR

Theology Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	The Unity of Mankind	7
II.	Education and Peace	18
III.	Economics and Peace	33
IV.	Diplomacy and Peace	50
V.	Humanitarianism and Peace	65
VI.	Science and Peace	78
VII.	Youth and Peace	90
VIII.	Disarmament	101
IX.	Christianity's Conflict with Militarism	116
X.	The Church's Right to Speak Out	129
XI.	Religion and Peace	143
XII.	Organizing the World for Peace	159
XIII.	Achieving the Peace Ideal	173
	Index	187

CHAPTER I

THE UNITY OF MANKIND

THE consummation of permanent world peace waits upon the universal recognition of the unity of mankind. And that unity is being attained. The oneness of humanity, heretofore regarded as the pet idea of the Utopian theorist, has become the serious concern of the scientist, the educator, the statesman, the economist, and the churchman.

There are, to be sure, enduring differences of race and of nationality. This cultural and racial variability accounts for the infinite complexity of modern civilization. To attempt to reduce mankind to the dead and monotonous level of sameness would be to attempt the impossible. Human nature cannot be molded in any such groove of artificiality. Each racial and national group has its own peculiar genius, its own art, its own music, its own culture. A Negro leader once said, "God knew what he was doing when he made me black; he wanted me to be black and not gray or white. I couldn't do what I can do if I was any other color, and I don't want to be any other color." Any philosophy of social reconstruction that fails to reckon with the fundamental fact of racial and national differentiation will come to ruin.

However, the folly of maintaining a wholly unnecessary divisiveness among the nations becomes increasingly apparent. Education has sinned against the unity of mankind. Our schoolmasters, with their yardsticks, have fatally divided the universe. They have run their own imaginary lines of disunity around the globe. They have set the West over against the East, the North against the South. Our histories have exalted one people to the disparagement of other peoples. We have been taught to emphasize the alleged inequalities of race. Our minds have feasted upon the fiction of racial and national superiority. We have talked about a racial germ plasm that would never be altered. Every part of the human anatomy has been examined in the laboratory, generally with the assumption that

physiology would pronounce its own benediction upon the finality of the *status quo*. Our geographies have pictured the seas as chasms that would never be bridged. The continents have been smeared with a variety of colors suggestive of a separateness that would never be disturbed. Thus has education warped the thinking process of the world's youth.

The politics and diplomacy of yesteryear were premised upon the principle of a divided humanity. Military alliances were formed to perpetuate what was then felt to be the political disunity of mankind. A competitive nationalism followed in the wake of this emphasis on the military aspects of national security. "My country, right or wrong," became the political philosophy of the professional patriot. The Cæsars, Machiavellis, Bismarcks, Napoleons, Czars, and Kaisers strutted across the stage of human affairs with spurs at their heels and sharpened sabers at their sides. Men of limited mental dimensions talked of the inevitable clash of color, of the vast outreach of imperialistic expansion, of conflicting political units. Upon the basis of this divisive nationalism huge armies were organized, navies were built, competitive military establishments were maintained, and, in due time, the hillsides of every nation were covered with the graves of the world's war dead, homes were shrouded in grief, mothers were made husbandless, and children, millions of them, were orphaned.

Big business has added to this confusion of disunity. Ruthless exploiters of natural resources in undeveloped countries, imperialistic landgrabbers and selfish seekers of world markets, have segmentized the human race for their own economic advantage. The flag has followed the dollar, and disputes arising out of this lust for financial and commercial power have been submitted to the arbitrament of the sword. Tariff walls have been erected making the governments of the earth parties to the frequent disruption of the world's peace. The industrialists of one nation held that their financial advantage involved, inevitably, the financial disadvantage of other nations. Public policies were made to conform to the economic requirements of private interests, and wars inevitably followed.

Religion, while preaching a gospel of brotherhood, has

often denied in practice the essential oneness of humanity. Christianity, with an arrogance totally unknown to its founder, has pitifully divided mankind. We have spoken of an Oriental Christianity, an Occidental Christianity. We have had an American Church, a Roman Church, a European Church, a Greek Church. We have had, and still have, "Protestant" countries and "Catholic" countries. We have had many "established" churches, instituted and maintained by governmental subsidies, the inference being that the church, when called upon to do so, would give spiritual sanction to nationalistic ends.

Other religions too have perpetuated the lines of cultural and geographic division. While all religions overlap one another in the area of their respective activities, it yet remains true that certain religions have been intertwined with the corporate life of certain nations—Mohammedanism for Turkey, Hinduism for India, Confucianism for China, Shintoism for Japan. All religions worthy of the name testify to the oneness of God and the unity of mankind. In practice, however, men have been willing, under the influence of a competitive sectarianism, to torture the devotees of opposing faiths.

The conclusion is forced upon us that during the centuries that have gone we have but dimly comprehended the essential unity of the human race. That is why we hate and kill one another. That is why we go on adding to the effectiveness of the instruments of military torture. We have not stopped to think. We have plunged headlong into the abyss of fratricidal conflict, only because we have been too stupid to realize that in war we kill our own flesh and blood.

I have four brothers. We are brothers by virtue of the fact that we are the flesh and bone of her who loves us. It is unthinkable that I would kill any one of these, my brothers. Only an insane man would lift up his hand against the offspring of his mother's womb. And yet I have other brothers, millions of them, brothers by virtue of the fact that my God is their God. We are bound together, all of the sons of men, by spiritual ties, ties that reach from the place where we live to the place where God lives. We forget this sovereign truth in times of military conflict.

Under the stimulus of a war mania we plunge a dagger in the breast of our brothers. The millions of men who sleep beneath the sod hard by the fields upon which they battled are brothers of mine. They are brothers of mine, every one of them.

The truth of this is slowly but surely dawning upon us. Appalled by the shameful waste of life occasioned by the World War, men have begun laying the foundations of a new society. The old education, the old diplomacy, the old business, the old religion are passing away. We are building anew. We are profiting by the mistakes of the past. We are turning away from the things that divide. We face toward the things that unite. We are constructing a civilization built upon the principle of peace, of human brotherhood. We are rising above the barbarism of disunity. We are premising our future upon the interdependence of nations, the unity of mankind.

Science is wrapping the world of yesterday in a scroll The telescope, microscope, and spectroscope, in the hands of an awakened intelligence, have brought the ends of the earth together. Science has achieved the solidarity of the physical universe. Distance has been annihilated. The world of yesterday was the size of an orange, figuratively speaking. To-day it is the size of a ten-cent piece. In 1807 Fulton operated the first steamboat on the Hudson River. Twelve years later the first steamer crossed the Atlantic, with the help of sails. The first steam passenger locomotive was operated in America in 1831. Thirteen years later Morse invented the telegraph. The world had begun to shrink. Then came the laying of cables, the invention of the telephone, and the establishment of wireless communications. The world all the time was growing smaller and smaller. The telephone mileage in 1913 was 33.7 millions; in 1925 it was 84.5 millions; to-day it is near 100 millions. The mail carried during this period had increased from 50,000,000,000 pieces in 1913 to 71,000,000,000 in 1925, and to close to 100,000,000,000 in 1929. There is a monument at Berne, Switzerland, the figures of which represent the five continents relaying a letter around the earth, thus symbolizing the interdependence of the nations. We are living in a new era of transportation and communication.

The airplane, the radio, and wireless telephony have made still more remarkable the miracle of science in annihilating what were once thought of as vast distances. Oceans and deserts are no longer barriers to progress. Science, in accomplishing the physical solidarity of the universe, has made of the world a neighborhood.

Education is laboring to achieve the intellectual solidarity of humanity. H. G. Wells has described the present world situation as "a race between education and catastrophe." Believing this to be true, the schoolmasters of the rising generation are approaching their task with the high resolve to serve the ends of peace. The teacher now regards himself not as the perpetuator of the past, but as the creator of the future. The student is thought of as potential power, not as a docile recipient of stored-up information. Inconsistent though it may seem, education is becoming more idealistic by becoming more practical. No longer content to speculate about the past, the educator is feeling his way slowly, but surely out into the actual world where history is being made. The objective of education for that reason has been considerably widened and its present-day aim is no longer simply to teach what has been, but what ought to be.

Training for citizenship—local, national, and international—is the goal toward which the education of the future moves. The World Federation of Education Association is one of the organizations that attempt to inculcate the peace ideal in the thought life of the world. It is organized, in the language of its constitution, "to foster the dissemination of information concerning education in all its forms among nations and peoples, to cultivate international good will, and to promote the interests of peace throughout the world." Thousands of public-school teachers the world over are committed to this high purpose. They have already begun the revamping of textbooks. History and geography are to be interpreted in the light of the peace ideal. There is to be no more bowing down before the altars of a drunken militarism. The halo of greatness is to be placed upon the heads of those who serve, not those who kill. The thinking processes of the children of the nations are to be emancipated from the ancient superstition

that war is inevitable. The teaching of patriotism and of devotion to one's own country will go on, as it should. But devotion to one's own flag is to be construed as being consistent with world citizenship. Goethe's motto, "Above the nations is humanity," is to become the intellectual measuring rod of this new education.

Diplomacy is following the gleam of a united world. This is not to say that there are not now, as there has always been, a considerable number of small-minded politicians whose eyes are glued on things as they are. In the legislative assemblies of the nations, in state departments and foreign offices there will be found those who still dream of imperialistic conquest and the exploitation of the weaker by the stronger. Mankind is still cursed by the self-seeking patriots who, like Machiavelli, proclaim the gospel that the state can do no wrong. But these small men are striking minor notes. They are out of tune with the larger harmonies of world friendship. While they rant about political isolation the leaders of a new diplomacy are pioneering their way into a larger future. The history of government plainly reveals a constant groping after larger areas of law and order. There was a time when every man was a law unto himself. This unrestrained individualism produced a state of barbarism from which the human race was a long time emerging. After many years of painful experience the tribe came into existence. Presently the Patriarch appeared, the "old man" of the tribe to whom the tribe members looked for guidance and protection. A number of tribes then organized under a single chief, and this process continued for many centuries. Then followed a succession of slave empires. Men began learning of the arts and crafts. Religion, crude though it was, began to play its part in the development of society. Both Greece and Rome extended the areas of governmental procedure. The bonds of race, of language, and of social customs had begun to bind men together. Motivated by the elemental urge of self-preservation certain of the Greeks envisaged the possibility of associating themselves together for their mutual protection and for the advancement of the common weal. Amphictyonies were formed at Delhi and Delos. The former of these associations functioned as a Court of Appeal. The Athenians,

Dorians, Thessalians were among the Greek peoples belonging to the Amphictyony near Anthela. This League, as it was sometimes called, consisted of a permanent Council which met twice each year. The members of the League undertook not to destroy any city of the League nor to cut off water supplies in peace or in war. They further covenanted to respect the holy places at Delphi and Anthela. Punishment, commonly administered, befell those members violating their sacred oaths.

Here were the beginnings of a world diplomacy. As early as five hundred years before Christ men had begun the task of writing a code of international law. Two centuries and a half later King Osaka of India fashioned a government upon the principle of persuasion as against force. It was said of him that "he ruled in peace, taught peace, and spread over an immense area the conviction that peace is better than war." The germ principle of world unity had begun to leaven the East. Across the sweep of the centuries this idea has continued to captivate the thinking of diplomats and lawmakers. The narrow nationalism of the Middle Ages could not submerge the hope that in law men would achieve liberty and freedom. The unity of mankind was eulogized at intermittent intervals by emperors and by popes. The emergence of the modern state under the impetus of the Protestant Reformation retarded the movement toward world organization. But ever and anon the dreamers of a higher civilization would arise to rebuke those who still espoused the political heresies of division. Toward the close of the nineteenth century this yearning of the diplomats and statesmen for world unity bore tangible fruit in the convening of the Hague Peace Conference. From that hour down to the present moment we have been moving in the direction of an organized political unity. Arbitration treaties have been entered into between the nations, treaties that seriously modified the then existing conceptions of national honor and of national sovereignty. Courts of Justice have been instituted. Commissions of Conciliation have been set up, and last but not least a League of Nations has been brought into existence, a League that, despite all of its shortcomings, represents the crowning glory of humanity's long struggle for a law-

ordered universe. Diplomacy has placed its seal upon the unity of mankind.

Nor can the economic interdependence of the nations be denied. Business men themselves have been among the first to recognize the truth of this. The production and distribution of commodities, the interchange of goods, the marketing of securities, and the international use of credit have made apparent the economic solidarity of mankind. Each race and nation needs the products of other races and nations. Herein is another evidence of the essential oneness of the human race. Or, as Jean Bodin put it in 1540, "God, in his admirable prudence, has arranged all these things in good order, for he has so scattered his blessings that there is no country which does not have need of many things. And God has apparently done this in order that all the subjects of his republic shall live as brothers." It has taken a good many wars to convince mankind of the inescapable logic of M. Bodin's position. That the lesson finally is being learned is evidenced by the creation of such organizations as the International Chamber of Commerce and the World Economic Conference, through which the business opinion of the world is being mobilized in the interest of peace. Economics, no less than science, education, and diplomacy, is bearing witness to the unity of mankind.

It is in the realm of religion where we come face to face with the unalterable verity of the common brotherhood of mankind. This is true despite the fact that religions generally, including Christianity, have often denied in practice the unity which they have proclaimed in theory. It is true of every religion worthy of the name that "there is neither Jew nor Greek, male nor female, bond nor free." The Hindu says, "To you I declare this holy mystery: there is nothing nobler than humanity." Says the Buddhist, "Let one cultivate good will toward all the world—a mind illimitable, unobstructed, without hatred, without enmity." To this the Confucianist adds, "Within the four seas all are brothers." The gospel of Islam is in principle no less universal: "To God belong the East and the West. Therefore whithersoever ye turn is the face of God. Verily, God is all-pervading, all-knowing." The words of the Jew-

ish prophet are inscribed in letters of fire upon the sacred literature of that ancient people, "And they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." Paul, in writing to the Ephesians, gave expression to the universality of Christianity when he said, referring to Jesus, "He is our peace, who made both one, and brake down the middle wall of partition." Thus would religion establish a sense of humanity.

The early Christian Church incorporated in its simple communal fellowship, the corner-stone principle of oneness with God. The "dividing partition" had been destroyed. The early church achieved a spiritual solidarity that was all the more remarkable in view of the cultural and racial complexities of the Mediterranean world. That sense of unity prevailed for many decades and was lost only when the church became preoccupied with its quest for temporal power and ecclesiastical prestige. For centuries the church rendered little more than lip service to the gospel of unity. Christendom became divided against itself. The church had merged its identity with that of the state, and the Christians of one land went forth to engage in battle with the Christians of other lands. The sect-mindedness induced by the Protestant Reformation only aggravated this condition of disunity. The World War threw into still bolder relief the tragic schisms in the family of God.

Since the war, organized Christianity has been making a desperate effort to recover the first-century emphasis on unity and brotherhood. These efforts are being made, not without success. The Commission on International Justice and Goodwill of the Federal Council of the Churches, the World Alliance for International Friendship Through the Churches, and the Catholic Association for International Peace are among the organizations making vocal the aspirations of the church for a humanity at peace with itself. Like groupings of the followers of Jesus in other lands are bearing eloquent testimony to the cosmopolitanism of the Christian enterprise. Moreover, other religions are lifting high the torch of peace and unity. The representatives of eleven of the world's living faiths met in Geneva recently

to prepare the way for the convening in the near future of a Universal Religious Peace Congress. This inter-religious peace movement could not progress were it not for the fact that the devotees of the world's faiths are growing increasingly conscious of their dependence upon one another in the task of establishing and maintaining the kingdom of God upon earth.

All of which tends to emphasize the imperishable truth that God is one and his children are brothers. That fact is as incontestable as the law of mathematics. There is no escaping it. Try as we will we cannot controvert the logic of creation. We speak a language of diversity, but the elemental passions of the human soul are everywhere the same. Men love and dream and aspire; they build homes, they rear altars, they live and die and live again. Religion teaches us that we are the offspring of a common Father. Our spiritual likeness to him cannot be effaced. We may not look alike, but we have been born in his image, every one of us. Our skins may vary in color, but the red blood of a common humanity courses through our veins.

Science is achieving the physical solidarity, education the intellectual solidarity, diplomacy the political solidarity, business the economic solidarity, and religion the spiritual solidarity of the human race. There can be no place for war in a universe where all men are brothers. Let it be reaffirmed—the consummation of permanent world peace waits upon the universal recognition of the unity of mankind. When men realize that they are of one blood, of one human family, they will lay down their swords. When the "dividing partitions" erected by selfishness, bigotry, and provincialism are broken down, men will walk in the paths of peace.

For Those Who Think

What influences, educational, economic, political, and religious, have tended to divide races and nations?

In what way is education achieving the intellectual solidarity of the universe?

What can be said about the political unification of the world? Is there a world diplomacy?

Can a nation attain to a position of economic independence?

In what manner did the early Christian Church exemplify the principle of oneness in God?

Is organized war out of date in the modern world? If so, why? If not, why not?

Can the unity of mankind be anything more than a dream so long as nations fight one another?

Which of the influences named in this chapter—educational, religious, economic, scientific, and political—is most necessary to the attainment of peace? Why?

CHAPTER II

EDUCATION AND PEACE

After the guns of conflict had been silenced in 1918 an Oxford scholar put this question to his contemporaries in England, France, America, Italy, China, and Japan: "What have you learned from the war?" The practically unanimous reply was, "We have learned our need of education." And why education? Because it is realized that if peace is to prevail, there must be a complete revamping of the corporate thinking of humanity.

Education has too often played into the hands of the god of war. Successive generations of children have been brought up on the theory that war is inevitable; that might makes right; that a rabid, one-hundred-per-cent nationalism is the highest form of patriotism; that the heroism of military conflict is the highest form of courage. Children were taught to believe that man is a fighting animal, that he had always fought and would always fight. The major emphasis of the teacher and his textbook was upon war. Young people were taught to look upon the Alexanders, Cæsars, Napoleons, and Bismarcks with awe and admiration. The exploits of the militarist were pointed to by the teacher as rungs of the ladder of fame upon which others might climb to glory and renown. War, so it was said, is the supreme act of the state, and is not infrequently the act of God. Youth of high-school age was taught to believe that the bearing of arms constituted the highest act of citizenship; that the wholesale killing of men in the arena of military conflict was of the essence of patriotism. War and militarism were exalted. Peace and pacifism were scorned.

The teacher's textbook in history ran red with blood. The battles of the great military heroes were fought over again in the classroom. The children, through the exercising of an excited imagination, accompanied Hannibal on his expeditions of lust and conquest. They followed Cæsar

over the Mediterranean world; they went with Napoleon to Marengo, to Austerlitz, and over the Russian snows; they fought with Gustavus Adolphus; they stood with Lord Nelson in that admiral's hour of naval triumph. Children were taught to believe in the arbitrament of the sword. There could be, it was said, no other way for the settlement of international disputes. Thus it came about that over the heads of teacher and pupils alike there hung the shadow of a sharpened saber.

The teacher's textbook in geography gave emphasis to the alleged divisions of humanity. Children were made to look upon the members of other races as "foreigners" or "pagans." Boundary lines between nations were regarded as geographical finalities. There was an implied contempt for religious and racial minorities. Little or no effort was made to understand the psychology of other peoples. The geographies of yesterday, like the histories, lacked the touch of universality. Texts were written with the thought of national self-interest in mind as over against the public weal of a common humanity. The so-called "backward peoples" were studied not with the thought of lifting these people out of their "backwardness," but with the thought of keeping them there. There was a congealing of national and racial lines, as the teacher of geography pointed with his yardstick of division to the seas and the continents. Children were thus deprived of a world outlook.

The effect of this faulty emphasis in education was to produce an infinite variety of mental kinks in the thinking habits of each successive generation. A few years of such misinformation and the mind of youth was a conglomerate mass of prejudices and superstitions. Knowledge, conceived of as a national commodity for the promotion of national ends, became a deterrent to progress. The tendency was to accentuate the pagan instincts of separateness and isolation. The school, under the influence of this utilitarian philosophy of self-interest, became the training ground for the cultivation of all sorts of bigotries and snobberies. In every country boys and girls grew into maturity firm believers in the pernicious doctrine, "My country, right or wrong."

As late as 1923 one could buy, in Paris, a French primer

containing a picture of German soldiers shooting down a little French boy. On another page a cathedral was pictured in ruins, and the following conversation was written into the text:

"My son," said my mother to me, looking me in the eye, "you will not forget these crimes?"

"I promise, mother."

At the end of the lesson there was a written exercise: "The Germans have killed . . . ." "They have bombarded . . ." "They have destroyed . . ." Could any child, grown to manhood, think and live peace on the basis of such instruction? Hardly.

Florence Brewer Boeckel, in commenting on a series of tests given by Dr. George Bradford Newmann to determine the attitudes of a group of high-school students nearing graduation, on such subjects as racialism, nationalism, imperialism, militarism, and humanitarianism, said: "The responses of the students showed a strong tendency toward nationalism, fear for the welfare of their own nation and suspicion of other nations; a tendency away from imperialism with a conviction in favor of self-determination for weaker nations; and a general tendency in favor of military preparedness which, however, it was held should not be allowed to interfere with the ideals of the nation. Although the students showed strong humanitarian tendencies, when they faced a conflict between their concern for humanity and for their nation, their nationalism tended to lower their humanitarian impulses to within the area of indecision."[1]

What caused the World War? Armaments? Yes, in part. The direct causes of the war were played up by the journalists and the politicians. They were, in the order of their importance, competitive armaments, faulty diplomacy, and the lack of world organization. The indirect, but deeper, causes of the war were rooted down in the prejudicial attitudes of millions of people on both sides of the trenches, attitudes of ill will and suspicion that had been cultivated through the years in the schoolrooms of every land. The writer enjoyed at one time an hour's conversa-

[1] *Between War and Peace*, pp. 16–17. The Macmillan Company, publishers. Reprinted by permission.

tion with Sir Ramsay MacDonald, the prime minister of Great Britain. The opinion had been advanced to Mr. MacDonald that the politicians had so clumsily handled the affairs of the world in 1914 that war had been inevitable. The British prime minister replied, in effect: "Yes, that is partly true. It must be remembered, however, that the politician builds with the materials handed over to him by the schoolmaster. We cannot build an enduring political structure on the basis of a citizenry whose attitudes have been warped by a narrowly conceived educational policy." Mr. MacDonald is right. Wrong attitudes, more than armaments, breed military conflict and international disaster. Of the one hundred causes of war listed by Tell A. Turner,[2] the great majority of them can be removed through education. Among these causes are the following: fanaticism, clannishness, servility, contempt, prejudice, suspicion, consciousness of power, jealousy, envy, popular delirium, bigotry, sectionalism, misunderstanding, and hatred. These attitudes of mind, out of which wars emerge, can be rendered obsolete by a change of emphasis in education.

This change of emphasis is being achieved. The school teacher is approaching the problem of world peace through a recognition of the educational solidarity of the human race. Education is no longer being thought of as a national commodity for the promotion of a selfish and unrestrained nationalism. Rather, education is being interpreted as a leaven of understanding, as a stimulant of mutual service. It is now seen that world peace is to be realized not so much through political activity confined to adults as through an educational adventure in behalf of the world's childhood. The most promising feature of this new approach to the solution of the riddle of peace is that it begins at the right end. From time immemorial we have pinned the hopes of to-morrow on the prejudices of maturity. We have fed the mind on the half-truths of nationalistic propaganda and then despaired because world peace proved so elusive. But a new start is being made, this time with the children. It is being wisely assumed

[2] *Causes of War and the New Revolution*, pp. 175–177. Marshall Jones Company, Boston, Massachusetts.

that the likelihood of international conflict is reassuringly diminished where mutual understanding is cultivated. It is ignorance and suspicion of one another that sharpens the swords and the sabers of militarism. Wars are not carried on by children, not simply because they are too young to fight, but for the more significant reason that they are too young to want to fight. The children of one nation do not despise or mistrust the children of other nations. But when these same children are taken over by an educational system that distorts the truth for the sake of national advantage and for the further purpose of cultivating a subtle hatred for national neighbors, pray tell what chance is there for international sanity? It is significant, therefore, that the educators are showing signs of repentance. The school teachers of the world are determined to put a stop to the nefarious practice of making education the abettor of international strife. They are no longer willing to be used as a "catspaw" for the coronation of political chicanery.

How is this campaign for world peace through education to be carried forth to fruition? In the main, through a scientific revamping of textbooks. The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace has been making a detailed study of the history texts of France, England, Germany, Belgium, Italy, and Bulgaria. These were the questions asked: "In what spirit do school histories present to their young readers the events of the five tragic years of the World War? What lesson is learned from the manner in which they recount the facts and comment upon them? Will the generation which is growing up in the schools learn from these books the horror of war, a sense of justice, a belief that a new era has begun for humanity, bought by the very excess of its faults and sufferings, or will these histories prolong the reactions of the war and give the impression that men will never cease to prey upon each other, and so, without hope, must continue to prepare themselves for more terrible conflicts?" It was found that German children were taught "Germany is guiltless; English jealousy and French desire for revenge were the chief among many causes"; that French children were taught, "The war was caused solely by 'German aggression,'" that

"The German Republic is a mere sham, and another war is already being planned in Germany."

In the meantime the teachers themselves have become interested in the problem of peace education. The World Federation of Education Associations was organized in San Francisco in 1923 "to secure international co-operation in educational enterprises; to foster the dissemination of information concerning the progress of education in all its forms among nations and peoples; to advise and promote suitable and effective means to bring into closer co-ordination the various agencies in every civilized country which have to do with education; to cultivate international goodwill, and to promote the interests of world-wide peace." A committee was appointed "to investigate the present teaching of history and history textbooks, stressing the need that history, whether elementary or advanced, should be just and true as far as it goes; that it should not be perverted in the supposed interest of national honor or partisanship, and should promote patriotism built upon love of country rather than upon hatred of any people."

This committee, in keeping with these instructions, and in co-operation with the American Association of University Women, has conducted a comprehensive examination of the history textbooks used in the schoolrooms of the United States. The standards or ideals on the basis of which this examination was made included the following: all materials used in teaching history should be carefully selected as to historic worth and accuracy; the facts as to conflicts between nations should be given with no attempt to determine the justice or injustice of either, the student satisfying himself from the facts; the texts should attempt to relieve national jealousies and racial hatreds; the facts of history should be selected with unfailing regard for those characters and events which have resulted in the advancement of the race toward freedom, better mode of living, culture, and the realization of ideals; war should be studied as an instrument or means of settling disputes among the primitive peoples and of use when nations had no other methods for the composing of their differences. As a result of this textbook study the conclusion was drawn that "the older books all show what is considered to-day too

great an emphasis on military history." The significant statement is then made: "The texts of recent date have cut down the proportion given to military history and substituted economic and social history."

The most serious criticism of present-day textbooks in use in the United States which the Committee made is "for sins of omission rather than commission." It was discovered that history texts contained little direct braggadocio, but a considerable amount of "indirect self-glorification." It is pointed out, for instance, that the majority of American textbooks, in interpreting the War of 1812, relate the burning of Washington by the British, without referring to the fact that Americans had burned the city of Toronto before, "leaving the impression in the mind of the student that the British were vandals who did things to which the American army would not stoop."

In this manner young people have been given a warped idea of the history of their own and other nations. Youthful minds have fed upon the poison of half-truths. Hostile attitudes have been created. War, instead of being attacked by the process of education, has been accepted as one of the inevitable by-products of human nature. Hence the need for an educational house-cleaning.

Before diagnosing the new educational program of the teachers it might be well to refer to the enlarged intellectual outlook of the governments of the earth. The Assembly of the League of Nations, in 1920, recommended that the Council of the League should associate itself, officially, with all steps looking toward the universal reorganization of intellectual endeavor, and the formation of a "universal conscience." The Committee on Intellectual Co-operation was set up by the nation members of the League, with the following program of activities: Institution of a general inquiry into the conditions of intellectual life; examination of the problem of assistance to nations whose intellectual life is especially endangered; study of questions of scientific property and of other questions of intellectual property; study of university co-operation; study of the international co-ordination of bibliographical research. In the development of this program national committees on intellectual co-operation have been formed in some thirty

countries, including the United States. It is the purpose of these committees and of the larger international committee to create a world-wide will to peace. An ambitious program of intellectual co-ordination is now under way, including such activities as interuniversity co-operation; the co-ordination of scientific work; the co-ordination of libraries; the co-ordination of bibliography in physics and its direct branches; the co-ordination of analytical bibliography in economic sciences; the publication by national committees of analytical summaries of the works of their respective scientists and authors; the unification of scientific nomenclature and of archæological terminology; the instruction of children and young people in the ideals and work of the League of Nations; the studying of the relation of the motion picture in its relation to world peace; the establishment of an international museum office; the studying of the possibility of organizing an International Congress of Popular Arts; the functioning of the International Institute of Intellectual Co-operation. We see here the first collective attempt ever made by governments, as such, to co-operate in the realm of education on an international basis.

Certain governments, separately, have undertaken to modify their respective educational policies in keeping with the requirements of a world bent on peace. France is interpreting the Kellogg Pact through her public schools.

French teachers, at the suggestion of the Ministry of Education, recently adopted the following resolution: "The 78,000 French teachers of both sexes, grouped in their national union, realizing their duties as educators, and being convinced that the reconciliation and co-operation of the peoples who fought against each other during the war must be hastened by education at school, decide to make every effort to lead the younger generation to the knowledge and understanding of other peoples, in order that it may thus contribute toward the organization of peace. They undertake to abstain in their teaching from any word which might be injurious to international understanding and to eschew all schoolbooks which advocate war and thus represent a danger for the organization of peace."

This resolution of French teachers, inspired at the direct

suggestion of the French government, takes on an added significance when viewed in the light of the newer educational objectives of the German government. The Constitution of the German Republic categorically states that the children of that nation shall be taught "in the spirit of German national culture and of international conciliation." After the Locarno Treaty, renouncing war as between France and Germany, had been signed, Doctor Mueller, at that time the director of higher education at Potsdam, said, in part:

"If the work which was done at Locarno is to have any permanent value, great demands will have to be made on education in all the countries concerned. . . . We must get away from the jingoistic spirit with which our education is at present for the most part imbued.

"If we are to be honest, we must renounce our belief in our nation as the elect of God. . . . All nationalist arrogance has its origin in this. With this realization as a basis, we must prepare the child for an entirely new life.

"This does not mean at all that the sentiments for one's own country and people are to be suppressed, but simply that the child shall be made to understand that the greatness of its native country no longer depends upon military strength and victory in war, but on the spirit of righteousness which rules the country—a spirit of righteousness which is big enough to include a true respect for the rights of other nations."

Mexico, following the successful termination of the Friendship School Bag Project, initiated by the Committee on World Friendship Among Children, instituted courses on international good will in all elementary schools, under the direction of Moises Saenz, minister of education.

In Czechoslovakia school children are instructed in the following: "Do not call anyone a patriot who hates other nations or despises them or desires war; war is a relic of barbarism. Love your country and your nation, but work to the end that all men may one day live together as brethren in happiness and peace, and that no nation need be afraid of being attacked by another." Peace will not be far off when governments generally preach a similar doctrine of patriotism. The day is coming when they will.

We come now to the teachers themselves. Believing that "what you would put into the future you must hide in the heart of the child," the educator is dipping his pen in the ink of interracial and international understanding and good will. A new history has already made its appearance. The French primer picturing German soldiers shooting down a French urchin, can no longer be bought in Paris. It has been withdrawn from circulation. It has been withdrawn because education has had a change of heart. A beginning has been made in shifting the emphasis in history texts from the military to the social, from war to peace. The old history depicted the alleged glory of war. The new history will strip war of its glory. The old history emphasized the national aspects of the corporate life of a given people. The new history, while recognizing the need of preserving national loyalties, will emphasize the international aspects, the corporate life of all peoples. Loyalty to country will be interpreted as being consistent with a devotion to humanity. The old history portrayed the victories of might and military prowess. The new history will set forth the victories of the human spirit in the realm of literature, invention, art, architecture, and industry. The old history eulogized the military method of settling disputes. The new history will give attention to the processes of peace, the negotiation of arbitration treaties, the setting up of commissions of conciliation and courts of justice, and the functioning of such organizations as the League of Nations and the International Labor office. The old history made much of the secret and contriving diplomacy of war-mad kings and queens and ministers of state. The new history will make much of the open diplomacy that gave to the world the Paris Peace Pact for the renunciation of war. Very little attention has been given by the historian to an interpretation of the substitutes for war. The old history made a detailed study of this and that battle, while only a casual reference was made to the establishment of the Hague Court and to the development of other methods of peaceful procedure. The new history will reverse this process and will trace the slow unfolding of the peace ideal and the efforts of human kind to incorporate this ideal in international relations. The old his-

tory fixed the responsibility of a given war upon a single nation. The new history, in the light of all the facts, will stress the joint responsibility of nations in the making of wars. The old history exalted a patriotism of war. The new history will exalt the valor and heroism of a patriotism of peace.

The old history deified the military despot, and youth was required to burn incense to the memory of those who had maimed and killed their fellow men. Those public benefactors who so nobly served their day and generation were crowded into footnotes and appendices while the exploiters and military tyrants had their deeds recorded in bold type on every page. The new history will give to the school children of every land a nobler conception of greatness. This is already being done. Not long ago the youth of some forty nations were asked to name the ten men who in their judgment had made the greatest contributions to the uplift of civilization. Louis Pasteur, of France, was accorded first place. Here was a man who had given himself in sacrificial devotion not only to his fellow men, but to the dumb beasts of the field, and the school children of the nations pointed to him as the world's greatest man! Not many years ago Napoleon Bonaparte was the school child's man of destiny. He was their hero. When it came to a study of France it was Napoleon, always and forever Napoleon. Children were told that if they wanted their names to be enshrined in history, they would do for their own country what Napoleon had done for his country. The writer recalls a debate in which he participated as a youngster. The question was: "Resolved, That Napoleon was a greater man than Hannibal." The writer won the decision of the judges in behalf of Napoleon on the ground, apparently, that the Corsican general had killed the greater number of his fellow men. Yesterday it was Napoleon. To-day and to-morrow it will be Pasteur. Yesterday the ideal man of history was a killer. To-day and to-morrow he will be a servant. Yesterday we studied Germany upon the background of such men as the Wilhelms and the Bismarcks. To-morrow we will study Germany upon the background of such men as Goethe, Beethoven, and Wagner. We will look at England as reflected in the lives of such

men as Shakespeare, Browning, and Milton. And so on with every people on the face of the earth. Teachers in this new era will stress the universal elements of biography. Tennyson doesn't belong to England any more, nor does Hugo belong to France, nor Dante to Italy, nor Emerson to America. Here are men who belong to the world. The immortal Livingstone, who gave his life for the release of Africa from the captivity of moral darkness, is a universal type whose character is not only the pride of England, but the proud possession of humanity. Literature too is universal, as are art, sculpture, music, and painting. The history of to-morrow will interpret these interests that bind the peoples of all races and nations together.

We are to have a new geography too. Differences will no longer be accentuated. Likenesses will be emphasized. Peoples across the seas and in distant places will no longer be pictured in such hideous outline as to stimulate that subtle psychology of revulsion that diseases the mind through successive generations. Textbooks descriptive of the child life of other nations are to be put into the hands of teachers in elementary grades. More advanced students will study a geography that recognizes the world as a physical unit and the races of mankind as a spiritual unit. That means that races and nations will be referred to as "neighbors," not as "foreigners." An effort will be made to interpret the effect of variations in climate and country on national character, variations which make obvious the interdependence of nations. By thus creating an attitude of respect for other peoples the new geography will remove one of the most prolific causes of organized military conflict. The development of the understanding mind and heart—that is the objective of the geography now in the making. The newer sociology, economics, and anthropology will further contribute to the expanding knowledge of others in terms of personality. Instincts of mutual respect will be engendered and the racial egoists will be deprived of one more of their stock arguments for the perpetuation of competitive armaments.

How stupid we have been through the ages! We have taught children to hate one another and then we have deplored what seemed to be the inevitability of war. But

the morning light is breaking and the new day begins to dawn. The printing presses of the world will soon be humming tunes of international good will as they turn out the textbooks of this new and better day.

Moreover, this new education contemplates the widespread practice of correspondence between the school children of the several nations. This correspondence will be used as a supplement to the regularly prescribed lesson material and will be interpretative of the life and customs of different peoples. There will be the further exchange of school work that will add the elements of the picturesque and dramatic to this romance of peace through education. Children will thereby become schooled in those attitudes of mind that make for a real and lasting friendship among the citizens of that world community which is now being created. The Junior Red Cross, the American School Citizenship League, and the Committee on World Friendship Among Children are among the organizations sponsoring this type of activity.

This international correspondence among school children is to be accompanied by the interchange of students and professors. The Institute of International Education in the United States, and like organizations in other countries, are developing to an amazing degree this particular form of intellectual co-operation between the academic leaders of the various nations. Distinguished scholars from Germany, Scotland, Spain, France, Czechoslovakia, Austria, England, Holland, Russia and Italy were circuited about various campuses in the United States during the year 1928-29. Fifteen thousand students from abroad are now studying in American colleges, universities, and preparatory schools. Student exchanges, made possible through the establishment of a large number of fellowships, are making more intimate the cultural relations between the United States and other countries. It is estimated that more than sixty representative American colleges and universities are co-operating in this international student exchange movement.[3] Governments and universities are being importuned to appropriate funds for the establish-

[3] See *Ninth Annual Report of the Director of the Institute of International Education.*

ment of scholarships for graduate study in different countries to a larger number of students. That the teachers themselves may possess an international mind it is being recommended that special courses in world citizenship be introduced in all teacher-training colleges and graduate schools of education. It is even ventured by some that the establishment of a world university is not a long way off. Such an intellectual center would have as its aim the synthesizing and correlating of all the higher functions of education as an aid to mutual good will and better understanding between nations. Students, finishing their academic work in such an institution, would receive with their degrees a sympathetic appreciation of those broad humanities that make possible international co-operation. Pending the fulfillment of these larger academic hopes, not a few educational institutions, at home and abroad, are establishing Departments of International Relations. Thousands of students are being equipped, through such study, to play the part of world citizens. The Walter Hines Page School of International Relations at Johns Hopkins University was formed to develop the science of peace. The students attending this school will explore all of the ramifications of the science of war. They will learn the art of peacemaking. They will throw the light of an awakened intellect on world affairs.

In his address setting forth the ideals of the proposed school at Johns Hopkins University, Mr. Owen D. Young said, "Our curse is ignorance." The educators of the world have accepted the challenge implicit in these words. They are studying as never before the standing incentives to war, economic, political, and commercial. War as a cosmic necessity is being made the subject of intensive research. The educators of the world have become peacemakers. What amazing progress! What a leap into the future! The hope that civilization may yet be spared grows brighter and brighter. Education has become redemptive in character and international in purpose. Five million school teachers from more than a half hundred nations are to become the evangels of that peace first promised to the world in the City of David nineteen hundred years ago. Hope rides high on to-morrow's horizon.

For Those Who Think

Characterize the education of prewar years. Was there, or was there not, a disproportionate emphasis upon the military aspects of history? Specify.

What, after all, are the real causes of war? Armaments? Politics? National distrust and suspicion?

Is there a need for the revamping of textbooks?

In what manner have history and geography texts perpetuated attitudes of racial and national bigotry?

What are the dominant characteristics of the new education with respect to peace?

Is it possible to educate future generations in the ways of peace?

What place has the militarist in history? the peacemaker? the public servant? the prophet?

What responsibility, if any, devolves upon the local citizenry in building up an educational system based upon the ideal of world justice and peace?

What responsibility have governments in this respect? Give examples of governmental interest in educating for peace.

Outline a program of peace education for children, youth, and adults.

CHAPTER III

ECONOMICS AND PEACE

WAR doesn't pay. That is the solemn conclusion reached by the captains of industry and the men who labor. It has been said that "in war a nation stands on its head to have its pockets picked." That is literally true. Millions of soldiers were killed in the World War, and to kill a single soldier required an outlay of $20,000. It has been estimated that the direct and indirect cost of the war represented the staggering sum of 337 billion dollars. Generations yet unborn will be required to pay for the folly of their fathers. It is difficult to believe that men could be so stupid as to waste such a large proportion of the world's wealth in a mad carnival of military conflict. No one will ever know what the war cost. National debts are known to the last dollar and cent, but the economic loss accruing from the vitiated vitality of the tens of millions of noncombatants will never be known. To the actual cost of the war there must be added the cost of preparations for war. This is seldom done. How much did it cost the warring nations to create and maintain their competitive military establishments prior to the war? No one can hazard a guess, but the total sum would stagger the imagination. The figures would be incomprehensible. If to this amount there were to be added the costs of the wars of the nations during the past five hundred years—such figures are beyond the reach of human intelligence. It is enough to say that the accumulated effect of these rash expenditures has worked out to the economic impoverishment of the human race.

Nor does it make much difference, economically, who wins the war or who loses it as wars are fought to-day. There are more evidences of economic disaster and industrial disorder in France to-day than in Germany, notwithstanding the fact that France won the war and Germany lost the war. A nation may win a war politically. It can

never win a war economically. Victors and vanquished together go down into the pit of economic confusion. It is not too much to say that another world war would result in an economic Armageddon for every race and nation. It is the realization of this truth that has made a peacemaker of the economist.

Moreover, business men and industrial leaders are coming to recognize the economic solidarity of mankind. War is an economic extravagance. That is admitted. Business is fighting war for that reason, but not alone for that reason. Business men are becoming peacemakers for the simple reason that they are conscious of an economic community of interests that makes peace indispensable to their own well-being and to the life of the world.

Is there such a thing as economic isolation? Not at all. That myth has been exploded once and forever. Julius Klein, one of the foremost business experts of the United States, states the case in this manner: "The textile mills in a small New England town come upon hard days; their principal market in far off North China has dwindled because the sole industry of those remote Mongolian villages has collapsed, thereby destroying the buying power of their poverty-stricken inhabitants. The reason? Their livelihood was gained from making hair nets; the sudden shift of feminine fancy brought on the bobbed hair "wave," and the once thriving Chinese hair-net industry now lies buried under four hundred thousand tons of long locks which have been shorn since the fashion started—whence comes at least a portion of the distress in the New England textile mills."[1] No nation is economically independent. The lanes of commerce over the seas carry their argosies of indispensable commodities to the ends of the earth. These lanes of commerce represent the economic nervous system of an interdependent universe. The severing of that nervous system at any point results in economic paralysis. We get hides from Argentine, wool from Australia, laces and linens from Belgium, sugar and coffee from Brazil, metals and ore from Chile, glass and pottery from Czechoslovakia, dairy products from Denmark, dyes from Germany, silk

[1] *"Whither Mankind?"* Edited by Charles A. Beard. Article by Julius Klein, p. 97. Longmans, Green & Co., publishers. Reprinted by permission.

from Japan, iron from Luxemburg, gold and diamonds from South Africa, matches from Sweden, and rugs and carpets from Turkey. The ranting of a high protectionist tariff enthusiast cannot make a single nation economically independent of its neighbors. Take the United States as a shining example of this incontrovertible truth. We sell 61 per cent of our cotton to Great Britain, Japan, Germany, and France; 46 per cent of our copper to Germany, Great Britain, and France; 39 per cent of our typewriters to Spain, Argentine, Mexico, and Russia; 34 per cent of our kerosene to China, Japan, Holland, and Great Britain; 40 per cent of our tobacco to Italy, China, Germany, and Great Britain; 28 per cent of our locomotives to Canada, Mexico, Brazil, Argentine, and Russia. We buy, in turn, 100 per cent of our rubber from such countries as Dutch East Indies, British Crown Colonies of Ceylon, and Straits Settlements; 100 per cent of our coffee from Brazil, Colombia, Java, and Mexico, and other countries; 100 per cent of our silk from Japan, China, and Italy; 100 per cent of our tin from Java, Hongkong, Straits Settlements; 100 per cent of our bananas from Honduras, Costa Rica, Guatemala; 100 per cent of our cocoa beans from British West Africa, Dominican Republic, Trinidad, and Brazil. Our foreign trade in 1927 amounted to $4,865,375,000 of exports, and $4,184,742,000 of imports.[2] In 1928 our exports amounted to $5,128,809,000 and our imports to $4,091,120,000. What is true of the United States is true of every other people on the face of the earth. There is no such thing as economic self-sufficiency. Mr. Herbert Hoover said in the course of one of his addresses on his South American tour of friendship: "A century ago our countries could and did live a primitive life without the exchange of products of the temperate zone for coffee, rubber, and a score of other articles. To-day, however, but for the products we exchange, not a single automobile would run, not a single dynamo turn, not a telephone, telegraph, or radio operate, and a thousand daily luxuries would disappear. In fact, without these exchanges of commodities, huge masses of humanity who have become de-

[2] See United States Bureau of Commerce statistics.

pendent upon an intensive and high-attuned civilization could not be kept alive."[3]

Are you economically independent? Consider this: "As soon as you get up in the morning the genii of foreign trade begin to minister to your needs and conveniences. The East Indies have contributed their vegetable oils to your bath soap and shaving cream. . . . You brush your teeth with fine bristles from the Far East, and smooth your hair with long vigorous bristles from China and England. . . . Proceeding to dress, you call upon all parts of the world for your personal adornment. Silk worms in Japan and China may have contributed to your hosiery, shirt, and tie. . . . Your garters and suspenders owe their elasticity to the rubber plantation of Sumatra, while your white linen collar and your linen handkerchief are made of flax from Ireland, Canada, Belgium, and the Netherlands. . . . Hurrying down to breakfast, you find either coffee from Brazil, tea from the Far East, or cocoa from tropical countries. . . . Leaving your house, you walk over asphalt from Trinidad, and take a train, the safety of which depends on air-brake hosing made of imported rubber. . . . You reach your office. . . . On the desk are to be found pencils, the lead of which is made of graphite from Mexico, Ceylon, Chosen, Canada, and Madagascar. On the end of the pencil is an eraser of imported rubber set in a cap of imported tin. . . . At the end of the day you pick up your hat, which is made either of straw braids from the Far East, or of fur from all parts of the world. . . . You buy an evening newspaper made of Canadian wood pulp."[4] Just how economically independent are we, after all?

Or, look at the question of economic interdependence from another angle, particularly from the standpoint of a citizen of the United States. The United States loaned $10,000,000,000 to some twenty nations during the period covered by the World War. These debts have now been funded over a sixty-two-year period, the payment to cover the original loan in full, plus a varying rate of

[3] Rio de Janeiro, December 22, 1928.
[4] From *Our Imports and Who Use Them.* Issued by the National Foreign Trade Council.

interest, according to the paying "capacity" of the debtor nation. The total payments to be made amount to over $11,000,000,000 in principal and over $10,000,000,000 in interest. Without raising the question as to the ethical propriety involved in the required payment of these war debts, the fact remains that on the basis of existing arrangements the debts must be paid. These debts cannot be paid unless the nations owing them are themselves financially solvent. Here again we are confronted with the international implications of economic prosperity.

There are also to be considered the vast sums tied up in the investments of individual Americans abroad and the repayment of the capital and interest represented in these industrial loans. American private investments have reached the unprecedented total of more than $15,000,000,000. Thirty per cent of this money has been invested in Europe; twenty-seven per cent in Canada; twenty per cent in Central America, including Cuba and Mexico; fifteen per cent in South America; five per cent in China, Japan, and the Philippines, and three per cent in other countries. These debts, as well as the war debts, are going to be collected in one of two ways—either at the point of the sword, in forced payment, or through the willing economic co-operation of the creditor and debtor nations. Under the terms of the Paris Peace Pact the sword has been ruled out of consideration. There is left, therefore, only one method of settlement, a peaceful one, a settlement premised on the economic prosperity of debtor peoples. This economic prosperity, in turn, is predicated on the recognition of the economic solidarity of the human race. The truth of this is being recognized, as is the supplementary truth that another war on a world scale would involve the almost certain economic disintegration of every nation.

Is it any wonder, then, that business men, economists and industrialists have joined the ever-enlarging procession of peacemakers? There was a time when industrialists reiterated the dogma, "Business is business, the public be damned." That day is gone. It will never return. It will not return because war follows in the wake of such a policy, and business has cast its lot on the side of peace.

We are witnessing the passing of that sordid and selfish

economic nationalism out of which the wars of the past have so frequently emerged. This is not to say that economic selfishness has become a thing of the past. Not at all. In some respects it would seem that the sense of economic nationalism was increasing rather than diminishing. A study of the existing tariff situation would seem to lend credence to this viewpoint. Certain nations have shown within recent years a deplorable tendency to increase the number of commodities falling under tariff regulations. Germany had 400 items under tariff in 1888; in 1925 she had a duty on 2,300 items. Italy had 535 items under tariff in 1878; in 1927 she had a duty on 2,777 items. Belgium had 235 items placed under tariff in 1884; in 1924 she had a duty on more than 2,000 items. France had 1,500 items under tariff in 1892; in 1927 she had a duty on 4,000 items.[5] We are informed, by this same authority, that the commercial treaties negotiated before the war generally ran for an average of ten years. Of the 180 treaties examined at the World Economic Conference in 1927 it was found that 153 were subject to change within a year. It was also discovered that the real weight of tariff had increased some thirty per cent since the war. This is anything but a happy situation, and were these conditions to be interpreted without relation to the more hopeful aspects of the present world economic situation, there would be sufficient ground for pessimism and despair. The writer has no desire to give the industrialists of to-day an entirely clean bill of health. There is still a vast amount of reaching out for economic gain involving the exploitation of labor on an international scale. There is still, as there has ever been, a tendency among capitalists to use the surplus values derived from the labor of others to exploit still other lands and other peoples. While there has been some talk about the conscription of wealth in the event of another war no such plan has yet been devised, to say nothing of receiving the serious consideration of a single responsible government. Certain plans have been drawn up which would have the effect of requiring civilians to labor for military wages, without at the same time pre-

[5] *Problems of Peace*, Third Series, Article by Humphrey Milford, p. 80. Oxford University Press, publishers. Reprinted by permission.

venting captains of industry from making fortunes as they did in the last war. There is a too ready tendency on the part of all the governments on earth to preach and practice the doctrine that "the flag follows the dollar." All that is admitted. All the more remarkable, therefore, that there should be in the process of development a business conscience that, given time, will make obsolete these long-intrenched business brutalities. What signs are there that would seem to argue for the emergence of a business committed to the ideals of international fraternity?

The International Chamber of Commerce, instituted in Paris in 1920, has undertaken to mobilize the business opinion of the world on behalf of peace. This organization is an international counterpart of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, and as such is a federation of all the important nations, forty-five in all. The International Chamber is organized to represent all the economic factors of international business, including finance, industry, transportation, and commerce; to ascertain and to express the considered judgment of those interested in international business; to secure effective and consistent action both in improving the conditions of business between nations and in applying solutions for international economic problems; to encourage intercourse and better understanding between business men and business organizations of the various countries; and, in the language of its constitution, "to promote peace and cordial relations among nations." The policies of the International Chamber are determined by a Council composed of representatives from each of the member countries. The Council meets not less than three times annually for a review of the problems germane to the economic peace of the world. This Council represents the collective genius of eight hundred and fifty commercial trade organizations with an underlying membership of more than a million and a half business men throughout the world.

The International Chamber concerns itself with problems of industry and trade, transport and communication, international finance, and the arbitration of economic and industrial disputes. The Court of Commercial Arbitration instituted by this organization has settled ninety-eight cases

since its inauguration in 1923; one hundred and fifty-five cases have been dropped and forty-two are still pending. The Industry and Trade Group of the International Chamber investigates and passes upon such questions as the treatment of foreigners and foreign corporations, the right of establishment and the suppression of compulsory passport visas; import and export prohibitions and restrictions; customs tariffs and practices; customs legislation and fines, and the unification of customs nomenclature. Through these and a myriad other activities there is being achieved "a gradual consolidation of the economic forces of the world, directed toward the common good. . . ." It is not claimed that this organization will function as a "cure-all" for the economic diseases of mankind. It is true, however, that we see here the development of an entirely new influence in world affairs, an influence totally unknown until postwar days, an influence which promises to minimize the dangers of economic misunderstanding, thus enhancing the possibility of an enduring peace.

Still other phases of industry and business have been and are being organized on an international basis. There are the International Institute of Agriculture, the Conference of Postal Administrations, the International Telegraph Union, the World Engineers' Congress, and the International Advertising Association. The Sixth Object of Rotary International is "to encourage and foster the advancement of understanding, good will, and international peace through a fellowship of business and professional men united in the ideal of service." Rotary believes that two agencies are necessary for the development and maintenance of friendly and just relations between nations: first, a legal system to define rights of contending parties, the perfection of which system is a governmental function; and, second, a citizenship in every country with an active good will toward all peoples. It is the specific task of Rotarians to develop not only among business men, but also among the people at large this spirit of constructive good will. Rotary's influence is felt in over forty-seven nations of the world where Rotary Clubs have been organized with a membership of some one hundred and fifty thousand business and professional men.

If anyone doubts that nations are one, economically, let him cast his eyes in the direction of Geneva, where there was convened in 1927 the world's first International Economic Conference. This conference was convened to remove, in so far as possible, the economic causes of war and to reduce to a minimum international rivalries and quarrels over such issues as territorial and colonial expansion, trade, waterways, boundaries, ports, taxation, monopolies, and markets. The conference was construed not as an isolated event, but as a step in a continuous process of international co-operation in the economic field. Prior to the convening of this particular gathering there had already been a considerable amount of international co-operation in the business and financial world. An International Finance Conference had been held in Brussels, in 1920, for the purpose of restoring order out of the chaos of postwar currencies. Austria, in 1922, and Hungary, in 1923, appealed to the Council of the League for deliverance from what seemed to be certain financial ruin. The restoration of both of these nations to a position of economic solidarity constitutes one of the most thrilling chapters in human history. Business had ceased to practice its inherited policy of nomadic barbarism, and had turned its hand to a piece of international service of the highest order.

And now the governments of the earth, fifty of them, including the United States, had sent their officially appointed representatives to Geneva "to remove, as far as possible, the economic causes of war, and to ameliorate the present unsatisfactory economic situation." The delegates, two hundred in number, consisted of economists, industrialists, workers, consumers, and agriculturalists. The mere convening of the Conference witnessed to the economic independence of all races, nations, and peoples. Consideration was given to the beneficial and detrimental influences growing out of international trusts, the relating of agriculture to the general economic life of the world, and the possible reduction of trade barriers. The relation between increased tariffs and peace, was argued for many days and the conclusion reached was summarized in the following language: "The essential conclusion which emerges from the discussion in this field is that the Con-

ference declares that 'the time has come to put an end to the increase in tariffs and to move in the opposite direction.'" Speaking of the tariff in another connection the Conference said: "This question [customs tariffs], notwithstanding its fundamental importance in the economy of each state, has now come to be considered as no longer being exclusively within the domain of national sovereignty, but as falling within the scope of problems for which parallel or concerted action among the different nations is possible and desirable. Each nation will then know that the concession it is asked to make will be balanced by corresponding sacrifices on the part of other nations." It cannot be denied that world peace is in the offing when business men of large caliber and wide experience begin talking about the imperative necessity of regarding the tariff as an international problem.

Furthermore, big business has been heretofore closely identified with the maintenance of large and competitive military establishments. It still is. But a new day has dawned when the business men who talk about internationalizing the tariff also affirm that "Whereas, the world as a whole still devotes considerable sums to armaments and to preparations for war, which reduce the savings available for the development of industry, commerce, and agriculture, and are a heavy burden upon the finances of the different states, entailing heavy taxation which reacts upon their whole economic life and lowers their standard of living, the [World Economic] Conference expresses the earnest hope that all efforts to effect, by agreements between states, limitation and reduction of armaments, and particularly those under the auspices of the League of Nations, will have successful results and thus alleviate the burdens described above." Here is a change of outlook among the leaders of business which might well be regarded with profound gratification by the war-weary nations of the earth. It will take a long time for such sentiment to become the prevailing opinion of the business world, but an auspicious beginning has at least been made.

Has the World Economic Conference produced any practical results? Yes. A Consultative Committee was appointed at Geneva to carry on the work of the Conference.

It is expected that this committee will meet in May each year, and its convening will be, in effect, the holding of a miniature World Economic Conference. The International Chamber of Commerce has already given its enthusiastic support to the working principles and policies of the Conference, and the Economic Council of the German Reich has thrown itself behind the Conference proposals. Sir Arthur Salter, director of the Economic Section of the League of Nations Secretariat, is authority for the statement that "nearly all the governments who took part in the Conference have accepted, in some form or another, the main substance of the Conference recommendations, accepted them in the sense at least of agreeing in principle."[6] It was further revealed at the 1928 meeting of the Consultative Committee that a number of commercial agreements had been entered into during the year providing for tariff reductions in a number of items through the insertion of the most-favored-nation clause, and that a number of important demands for increased tariff rates had been rejected. A number of bilateral conventions between pairs of countries were concluded in 1928, the favorable terms of which have been made available to countries not parties to these agreements through the insertion of the most-favored-nation clause. "All of which seems to indicate," says Mr. Salter, "that the rapid upward movement of trade barriers in 1927 has been arrested. . . ."[7]

The influences exerted by this newly created interest in tariff making are producing results. Great Britain, at the 1929 Assembly of the League, put forward a project for a world-tariff holiday. This suggestion was promptly indorsed by France and Belgium, and approved in principle by many other nations as a move toward economic disarmament. The proposal of Aristide Briand, the French premier, for a United States of Europe also has relevancy in this connection. What is envisaged here is an economic and political federation of European states that will lessen the possibilities of war.

Labor is also contributing to this growing sense of the economic solidarity of the human race. Labor's stake in

[6] *Problems of Peace*, Third Series, p. 83. Oxford University Press.
[7] *Ibid.*

peace is universally recognized. Labor has everything to gain and nothing to lose in doing all within its power for the establishment and maintenance of world peace. Labor pays dearly in war and gets less than nothing in return. The workers bear the brunt of the fighting and they also pay for the costs of war. The so-called peace of 1918 brought untold misery to the workers of the world. A vast army of unemployed, estimated at 1,500,000 men, women, and children, is still walking the streets of England in search of employment. All this despite the fact that no hostile army invaded British soil. The wages of the British miner is only 90 per cent of the prewar standard. The wage-earners of France and Germany and other Continental powers are hardly any better off. Everywhere, with the possible exception of the United States, the laboring classes have been and still are paying dearly for the follies of war. They face the menace of continued unemployment, they suffer from a high cost of living induced by heavy taxation, they eke out a miserable existence as a result of depressed wages. In the event of another war the workers would be conscripted and placed on a strictly military wage scale; they would suffer, many of them, from a hunger blockade, their factories would be bombed from the air, their children would die, the victims of poison gas and disease germs. Another war would reduce labor to a pitiable state of economic bondage.

The enlightened workers of the world now see that their only hope is in the preservation of peace. The labor movements of many countries indorsed the Paris Peace Pact and adopted resolutions calling upon their respective governments to adhere to this instrument for the renunciation of war. The present administration in Washington and the Labor government of Great Britain are summoning the nations to cast off their burdens of competitive militarism and to walk in the ways of peace. Labor, no less than business, has sensed the need of co-operation in the achievement of a warless world. It is a credit to labor that it has not become enamored with the communistic doctrine of world revolution. The more progressive leaders of labor see no hope of escape through the establishment of a proletariat dictatorship. They insist, no less than their Russian con-

temporaries, on the industrial reorganization of society as a step that must be taken before permanent world peace can be won, but they refuse to take into their hands the bludgeon of the revolutionist. Theirs is a program of world co-operation, not of an international class war.

Labor knows that wars are often caused by an unfair industrial competition, a competition made possible by a disparity in the standards of labor in the various countries. In the so-called backward countries little children and aged women are put into an industrial harness. They work long hours and for miserable wages, and the products of their labor are sent out into the world market at cut-rate prices. Before long the trenches of an economic war are dug across the continents and presently this economic war becomes a long-drawn-out battle between contending armies. The workers lose out at both ends of this inhuman process. They work for slave wages at one end. At the other end they forfeit their lives, leaving their wives husbandless and their children fatherless.

In the International Labor Organization the workers of the world have been given an opportunity to bring to an end the economic confusion caused by varying industrial standards. Governments and the employers of labor co-operate with the workers in this co-operation campaign against the continuance of an unrestricted industrial competition. The peacemakers at Versailles, realizing that "peace can be established only if it is based upon social justice," instituted the International Labor Organization. On the walls of the Geneva headquarters of this organization there has been engraved that part of the Versailles Treaty having to do with the establishment of this co-operative enterprise:

"*Whereas,* conditions of labor exist involving such injustice and hardship and privation to large numbers of people as to produce unrest so great that the peace and harmony of the world is imperiled and an improvement of these conditions is urgently required; and,

"*Whereas,* also, the failure of any nation to adopt humane conditions of labor is an obstacle in the way of other nations which desire to improve the conditions of their own countries, the high contracting parties, moved by senti-

ments of justice and humanity, as well as by the desire to secure the permanent peace of the world, agree to the establishment of an International Labor Organization."

These words deserve to be enshrined in the literature of peace. For the first time in history the spokesmen of government, capital, and labor have been given an opportunity co-operatively to formulate international policies with regard to labor and industry. There, in Versailles, with a few strokes of the pen, labor achieved not only a victory for itself, but a victory for the peace of the nations.

The International Labor Organization functions in a very simple, but effective manner. There is, in the first place, the annual conference, representative of national governments and of the organizations of capital and labor. Each state member of the League of Nations (which, of course, leaves the United States out of this great moral crusade) is entitled to send to this Conference two government delegates. The organized employers of each country send one delegate and the workers one delegate. Governmental agencies, capital and labor, are thus brought into a great co-operative body for the improvement of industrial standards and for the promotion of the peace of the world. Of the greatest importance is the fact that labor has been given a voice, a voice that commands the respectful and serious attention of the enlightened conscience of mankind. The annual conference "determines and proclaims the conditions of industry which ought, in justice, to prevail throughout the world." Agreements or "conventions" on industrial affairs are drafted and submitted to the co-operating governments for legislative procedure. In all of these deliberations the guiding principle has been established that labor is not a commodity to be juggled about by the seekers of private gain. In addition to the Annual Conference there is a Governing Body of Twenty, corresponding in some respects to a Cabinet, and to which there have been delegated certain executive and administrative responsibilities. This body is likewise representative of governments, of capital, and of labor. The International Labor Office functions as a permanent secretariat with headquarters at Geneva. This office engages in a research type of activity, collecting information regarding

social and industrial conditions the world over, and dragging to light all of those industrial abuses that heretofore were provocative of military conflict.

Peace, in the noblest sense of that word, cannot prevail in a world festered by child labor. The question of industrial child labor was, therefore, one of the first issues to be taken up by the International Labor Organization. Data were secured from every nation regarding the labor of children. In Persia, for example, it was found that thousands of boys and girls, five and six years of age, were employed by certain carpet manufacturers, that in the industrial areas of China and other countries in the East children no more than out of their mothers' arms were put to hard and arduous tasks for many hours every day of the week. Manifestly, such a condition, if left unremedied, would sooner or later precipitate a serious economic emergency and a possible disruption of the world's peace. After careful study and long deliberation, the annual conference adopted a convention calling for the abolition of child labor and stipulating that children under fourteen years of age ought not to be allowed to engage in industrial pursuits. Child labor will not immediately be brought to an end by the negotiation of this convention, but a standard of industrial righteousness has been set up in the light of which governments and capital will be judged. Many nations have already enacted laws in accord with the provisions of this agreement.

Still another convention has been formulated by the annual conference of the International Labor Organization, calling for the adoption by all nations of the eight-hour working day. Public opinion will soon compel the nations to adopt legislation consistent with the standard envisaged at Geneva. Other legislation of the annual conference covers such questions as the employment of women and children at night work, the setting aside of a weekly day of rest in industry, the adoption of precautions against industrial accidents and unemployment, employment of women before and after childbirth, minimum age of admission of children to employment at sea, minimum age of admission of children to employment in agriculture, workmen's compensation, the safeguarding of employees from

occupational diseases, and sickness insurance. The remedying of these conditions of industry does not lie within the province of the separate national unit, but through the co-operation of all nations on the basis of international agreement. It has now been demonstrated that the new economic order, so indispensable to the pacification of the world, can only be accomplished as government, capital, and labor work together. The collaboration of politicians and the captains of industry is nothing new. It is the emergence of the voice of labor that makes the functioning of the International Labor Organization of such extraordinary significance. Labor wants peace and it is now in a position, as never before, to demand peace. The growing body of international labor legislation testifies to the expanding sense of solidarity among the workers of the world. The adoption, by so many governments, of uniform labor standards considerably enhances the prospects of an enduring economic peace. When there is economic and industrial peace, on a world basis, there is more likely to be political peace.

More than twenty million working men and women are members of the International Federation of Trade Unions. It is one of the specific objectives of the Federation to unite the laboring classes of all nations in a campaign against war and militarism. The achievements of the Federation, when contrasted with those of the International Labor Organization, although somewhat negative in character, are conducive to peace and to the further strengthening of the will to peace among the workers.

One of the officers of the American Federation of Labor has just recently issued a call for the formation of a world federation of trade unions, with national and hemispheric autonomy. Mr. Woll's proposal would, in effect, bring together into organizational fellowship, the International Federation of Trade Unions with headquarters at Amsterdam, and the Pan-American Federation of Labor, with headquarters in Washington.

Business and labor agree with Anatole France: "Whether we wish it or no, the hour has come when we must be citizens of the world or see civilization perish." To give effective practical embodiment to this conviction the

workers and the employers of labor are visualizing their common tasks from an international standpoint. They are undertaking to establish that social justice upon which peace is based.

For Those Who Think

Is war an economic benefit to the victorious nations?
What are some of the economic liabilities of war?
What about the theory of economic isolation? Illustrate.
Are the people of the United States economically independent? If not, what bearing has this fact upon the problem of peace?
What can be said in defense of high protective tariffs? What effect do these tariff walls have upon the realization of the peace ideal? Is free trade the way out of our economic difficulties?
When was the first International Economic Conference convened? What are the objectives of this organization?
Explain the activities of the International Labor Organization.
What social and industrial conditions are inimical to peace? How can these conditions be corrected?

CHAPTER IV

DIPLOMACY AND PEACE

CONSTITUTIONALISM is finding its way into world politics. The result is a new diplomacy, a diplomacy committed to the ideal of peaceful fellowship among the nations. The diplomats, in other words, are learning the art of peacemaking. The moral, economic, and political interdependence of races and nations is being universally recognized by those who occupy seats of power in the chancelleries of the world. For centuries the diplomats were the defenders of war. In most cases they were the perpetrators of wars. The power of the pen was eulogized in public orations, but it was the power of the sword that set the tongues of diplomats wagging. To-day it is different. Diplomats have had a change of heart. Diplomacy has linked its influence with education, business, and religion in unmasking war and in preparing for peace. In many ways the diplomat has been forced to do this. The people of the world have long been convinced that peace is attainable. Their hopes, however, have been frustrated by the politician's clumsy handling of world affairs and by the moral obtuseness of diplomats generally. Now a war weariness has overtaken these same people. The spirit of revolt has arisen within them, and they have evidenced such an uncompromising hatred of the institution of modern war that the diplomats, in self defense, have been obliged to pursue the paths of peace. On February 13, 1923, Senator William E. Borah introduced a resolution in the Senate calling upon the nations to repudiate and outlaw war by formal treaty action. This resolution was frowned upon by State Departments and Foreign Offices. Diplomats laughed at the proposal. It was said that such a thing had never been done and that it never could be done. Again, on April 6, 1927, M. Briand, the foreign minister of the Republic of France, indicated his willingness "to subscribe publicly with the United States to any mutual

engagement tending to outlaw war . . . as between these two countries." The State Department at Washington took no official cognizance of this proposal. Two months later, M. Briand, in a draft treaty submitted to the government in Washington, suggested that France and the United States "condemn recourse to war and renounce it respectively as an instrument of their national policy toward each other." Weeks elapsed. The State Department did nothing. In the meantime the people of the United States had caught the challenge of a warless world as embodied in M. Briand's proposal and insisted, as was their right, that France's offer be accepted and that a renunciation of war treaty be negotiated on that basis. This was done, but it was only done after the people had insisted that it be done. It is quite proper to say, therefore, that the diplomats in their peace activities have only been trying to catch up with the people whom they are supposed to represent.

What was the old diplomacy and what is the new diplomacy? In the first place, the old diplomacy was premised on the doctrine of an inviolable "national sovereignty." Perhaps no other word in the category of language has been so consistently misconstrued, so often lied about, as the word "sovereignty." That word has been made to cover a multitude of sins. To illustrate, there is a close parallel between the repudiated doctrine of "personal liberty" and the philosophy, still widely current, of "national sovereignty." The generation that is passing witnessed in its days the repudiation of the "personal liberty" superstition that obstructed for so long a time the progress of social righteousness. "Personal liberty" was the stock argument of the trafficker in all sorts of evil practices. All forms of licentiousness and bestiality were tolerated because it was believed that society had no right to curb the conduct of the individual. The conscience of Christendom has now condemned and renounced the vulgar implications of that jingo exaltation of individual rights. Each individual, graciously or otherwise, has been required to submit to an infringement of his personal rights and his personal liberties in behalf of social morality and social solidarity. However, the repudiated philosophy of "personal liberty" has,

for a long time, penetrated the thought-life of the nations. "National sovereignty" as interpreted by the old diplomacy meant nothing more nor less than the exaltation to national dimensions of the doctrine of "personal liberty." "Sovereignty" has been construed as a national entity, positively unlimited in its implications and without restraint of any kind whatever. Little consideration was given by one nation to the possible consequences of such a policy on the destiny of other nations. The old diplomacy was saturated with the conception that a sovereign state could not be interfered with in the international application of its policies.

The new diplomacy is premised on the doctrine that nations, no less than individuals, must be made to respond to the collective needs of a common humanity. The peace of the world is wrapped up in this changed viewpoint. The negotiation of arbitration treaties and the establishment of International Courts of Justice glowingly testify to the fact that nations are less prone to prattle about their "sovereign" and "inalienable" rights. The doctrine of "national sovereignty" is being repudiated and it will repose presently in a twin grave beside that of "personal liberty." The new diplomacy believes that if the individual has no right to live unto himself alone, no nation has that right. It believes that if the individual is forbidden by the unwritten law of social responsibility from engaging in acts that might compromise the well-being of any other individual or group of individuals, the nations of the earth must submit to the same logic. The old diplomacy believed that a State was a law unto itself. The new diplomacy believes that a State is a constitutional organism responsive to the will of the people as that will is expressed in terms of law.

Then, again, the old diplomacy was preoccupied with safeguarding what it was pleased to call "national honor." What is "national honor" anyway? As in the case of "national sovereignty" the concept of "national honor" has been foully abused. It has often happened that shrewd and calculating politicians, in search of some bewitching word that would inflame the emotions and anæsthetize the reason, have spoken loosely about "national honor." It was

not given to mere mortals to rationalize that term. Even to attempt an analysis of "national honor" was regarded by many as a reflection on one's patriotism. For centuries the honor of a nation has been identified with belching guns and marching armies. It has seemed quite impossible to think of "national honor" in terms of peace and of international good will. What the nations have needed more than they have needed ships, men, or money has been an interpretation of "national honor" that would make patriotism synonymous with righteousness. The insistence of diplomats of the old school to exempt from arbitration all disputes involving the "national honor" of the nations in question has been a source of international confusion and unrest. Of late years the question has been raised, what is there about the "national honor" of a given people that cannot be arbitrated?

The new diplomacy is answering that question. It is now seen that a righteous world order can never be attained so long as politicians are permitted to toy in a Fourth-of-July oration with the "national honor" of this nation or that. The diplomacy of recent days refuses to regard the "national honor" of any people as being above and beyond the appeal to reason and to law. Questions of dispute involving "national honor" are now to be arbitrated according to the specifications of a number of recently negotiated treaties. The Paris Peace Pact, for example, states that "the settlement or solution of all disputes or conflicts of whatever nature or of whatever origin they may be . . . shall never be sought except by pacific means." "All disputes of whatever nature" refers to all quarrels ever arising among nations, including, of course, questions touching upon the so-called "national honor" of the signatory powers. The General Treaty of Inter-American Arbitration, signed by the United States in January, 1929, contains none of the nullifying or devitalizing clauses so characteristic of the treaties negotiated by the diplomats of former days.

The diplomacy of yesterday was carried on in secret. In those days the foreign secretaries of the nations bargained with one another behind closed doors. The people were never informed as to what was going on. International negotiations were held to be too "delicate" for popular

handling. Under this cover of diplomatic darkness the peoples of the earth were juggled about in a most pagan manner. The diplomacy of to-day is founded upon the principle that the people have an inalienable right to know to what international obligations they are being committed by their respective public servants. The negotiation of the Paris Peace Pact furnishes tangible evidence of the participation of the people in the drawing up of an extraordinarily important international document. The people of the interested nations were fully informed of the progress of the negotiations. M. Briand's original offer was given to the press. So too was Mr. Kellogg's reply. For months the newspapers of France and the United States, and of the world, in fact, carried a detailed story of the gradual unfolding of this greatest of diplomatic achievements. The Paris Peace Pact is a people's treaty. It was negotiated in the open and is the gift to the world of a diplomacy dedicated to the consummation of peace. The full texts of all of the more important treaties being negotiated to-day are given to the public press. Never before in the world's history has diplomacy been so open and above board. Moreover, the texts of these treaties are being deposited at Geneva, under the care of the League of Nations. The old days of secret political conniving are gone, never to return. The publication, after the World War, of the secret treaties existing prior to and during the period of the war, made plain to an astounded world the moral bankrupty of the old diplomacy. Hereafter international compacts will be worked out under the vigilant eye of a knowing public. The divine right of the people to mold their own destiny is the keynote of this open diplomacy.

The old diplomacy smacked of militarism. There was a beaten path between the office of the minister of state and the minister of war, and over this path the diplomats and the militarists hurried, the one to make known a new diplomatic balance of power; the other to make known a new military balance of power. Premised as it was upon the contingency of war, it was perhaps inevitable that diplomacy should lean heavily upon the military. Thus it was that wars occurred. Thus it was that after the wars were over, the militarists were on hand at the convening of the

peace conferences to see that the diplomats made no mistakes. The average peace conference has been little more than a convening of generals and admirals, with a comfortably cushioned seat reserved in the background for the emissaries of state. That preponderance of military influence was in evidence at Versailles, notwithstanding the fact that the men who constituted the Big Four were civilians.

The new diplomacy is being evolved in civilian atmosphere. World policies are being shaped by such men as Hoover, MacDonald, Briand, and Stresemann,[1] men who are devoted to the peace ideal. The statesman is forging to the front. The militarist is being asked to take a back seat. When, at the Washington Disarmament Conference in 1921, a civilian statesman, Secretary Hughes, took the guidance of the deliberations into his own hands, a result significant for peace was attained, with a consequent scrapping of thousands of tons of fighting craft. When, at the Geneva Disarmament Conference in 1927, the military technicians dominated the scene, there was little opportunity for the diplomats to succeed, and they didn't succeed. The Geneva Conference, however, succeeded in spite of its failure. It made known to an already suspicious public the inexcusable folly of subordinating the voice of the statesman to the voice of the militarist in the conduct of world affairs. With that lesson learned the statesmen of to-day are determined to forge ahead in the formulation of their policies, unmindful of the obstructing tactics of the militarist. Ambassador Dawes, shortly after assuming his post at the Court of Saint James's in London, made a pronouncement to the effect that in the future, disarmament conferences would be guided in their deliberations by civilian statesmen, not by military experts. He stated that the opinions of the military expert would be considered for what they were worth, but that the determining of policies and the shaping of conclusions would be the task of the statesman.

The old diplomacy, again, was motivated with the "balance-of-power" theory. Diplomats once did little more than to trot over the earth setting up alliances, "holy" and otherwise, alliances that were supposed to guarantee the

[1] Died October 3, 1929.

security of the participating nations by a fine balancing of the military power of the contending groups. The new diplomacy is co-operative in principle, and all-inclusive in practice. The "balance-of-power" theory has been repudiated and in its place there has arisen a concept of political procedure that carries implications of benefit to every race and nation. This co-operative diplomacy finds expression in such instruments as the Peace Pact of Paris and the Covenant of the League of Nations. Such is the new diplomacy—a diplomacy that looks upon war not as an institution to be protected by law but, rather, as an institution to be condemned and renounced by law.

This new diplomacy of peace scored its first victory in the convening of the Hague Conferences in 1899 and 1907. These conferences gave widespread currency to the idea that statesmanship, through collaboration on an international scale, could function in the interest of peace as well as of war. Secretary of State John Hay, in his celebrated instructions to the American delegates, said: "The duty of sovereign states to promote international justice by all wise and effective means is only secondary to the fundamental necessity of preserving their own existence. Next in importance to their independence is the great fact of their interdependence. Nothing can secure for human government and for the authority of law which it represents so deep a respect and so firm a loyalty as the spectacle of sovereign and independent states, whose duty it is to prescribe the rules of justice and impose penalties upon the lawless, bowing with reverence before the august supremacy of those principles of right which give to law its eternal foundation." Here was a new political philosophy, a philosophy of law and of government that was destined, before another thirty-five years had elapsed, to reshape the political thinking of mankind. The Hague Conferences provided for a panel of jurists appointed by the several states affixing their signatures to the convention. If a dispute arises and the parties so desire, they may constitute the tribunal and initiate processes of arbitration. Forty-four states, including the United States, made appointments to this court in 1926. In the first twenty-five years of its existence this court functioned in twenty-two

instances for the peaceful composing of international disputes. These conferences, as subsequent events proved, marked an epoch in the history of the human race. Arbitration had now become a world issue, an ideal to be preached and practiced by nations claiming to be civilized.

During the earlier part of the twentieth century the more forward-looking statesmen sought to incorporate the Hague standard of judicial and arbitral procedure in the international relations of nations. It was not an easy thing to do this. The power of the sword had so long bewitched the imagination of men that any effort to sheathe that instrument of torture met with the accumulated resistance of a Napoleonic militarism and a Bismarckian diplomacy. Notwithstanding the obstacles set in its way the new diplomacy of peace forged ahead. Even before the convening of the first Hague Conference nations had begun the practice of appealing to the arbitrament of reason. Between 1856 and 1896 there had been 118 arbitrations[2] between nations. One of the most notable of these diplomatic victories had been that of the Alabama case. The Alabama, built at Birkenhead and equipped at sea for war purposes, fought on the side of the South in the Civil War. The British government, knowing the nature and purpose of the Alabama, permitted her to sail. At the termination of the Civil War the United States government filed a claim for damages against Great Britain. The dispute arising out of this claim was referred for settlement to an Arbitration Commission at Geneva. The award of this Commission was accepted in good faith by both parties to the controversy. Again in 1898 a vexing boundary dispute arose between Venezuela and Great Britain involving the exact location between the former country and British Guiana. This dispute was settled by arbitration.

One of the first settlements made under the Hague Convention of 1899 was that involving the Behring Sea dispute between the United States and Russia. The arbitration movement by this time had gathered considerable momentum. The people had begun to believe that war, after

[2] The term "arbitration" is to be taken here in its broad sense, signifying pacific settlement by the decisions of arbitrators, judges, commissioners, etc.

all, was not inevitable; that peace, through the functioning of arbitral processes, was attainable. Reference can be made here only to a few of the more outstanding developments in the evolution of this diplomacy of peace.

During 1908 and 1909 the United States adopted arbitration treaties with twenty-two other governments. These treaties, commonly known as the Root Treaties, specifically excepted from arbitration all disputes which involved "the vital interests, the independence, or the honor of the two contracting states, and do not concern the interests of third parties." As we have already seen, the inclusion of this qualifying phrase considerably weakened the significance of these treaties.

Perhaps the most popularly dramatic event in this trend toward arbitration was when Secretary of State Bryan, on April 24, 1913, called together the thirty-six representatives of foreign governments resident in Washington and laid before them a proposal for the promotion of peace in which the parties were to "agree that all questions of whatever character and nature, in dispute between them, shall, when diplomatic efforts fail, be submitted for investigation and report to an international commission (the composition to be agreed upon); and the contracting parties agree not to declare war or begin hostilities until such investigation is made and report submitted . . . ." This plan met with an immediate favorable response. By July 7 of that same year no less than twenty states had accepted the proposal and negotiations were begun. Thirty-five states finally accepted the plan in principle, resulting in the negotiation of thirty "peace treaties." Among the more powerful countries involved were, in addition to the United States, Italy, China, France, Great Britain and Russia, and among the smaller states, Brazil, Paraguay, and Sweden.

The World War broke in upon these arbitral processes with a vengeance. When, after more than four years of carnage and bloodshed, the smoke of battle had cleared away, the essential weaknesses of these prewar arbitration treaties stood out in bold relief as a challenge to the diplomacy of peace. It must be said, to the everlasting credit of the great majority of the world's statesmen, that

they accepted the challenge implicit in those four years of disaster and started to build anew their palace of peace.

Out of the Paris Peace Conference the League of Nations emerged. Born in the midst of doubt and cynicism, the League stood out before the world as an instrument of peace, a covenant of international friendship. Article XII of the Covenant commits the member states not to resort to war until the question in dispute has been submitted to arbitration or mediation by the Council, and until a period of three months after the award of the arbitrators or report of the Council. This article of the Covenant of the League is equivalent to 1,485 two-nation arbitration treaties. The Covenant once and forever displaced the old theory of "national sovereignty." The disavowal of the Renaissance theory of sovereignty was made complete when the Paris Peace Pact became effective on July 24, 1929.

The World Court of Justice, established in 1922, now adhered to by fifty-two nations, gave a tremendous urge to the still further development of the new diplomacy. The principle of "compulsory arbitration" was provided for in the Protocol establishing the Court, and forty-two governments, including Germany, England, and France, have accepted this principle in good faith.[3] The Assembly of the League of Nations, in 1924, drafted a Protocol for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes, which provided that the signatory states were to recognize as compulsory the jurisdiction of the World Court. The states adhering to this Protocol were to agree, further, to a system of compulsory arbitration for nonjusticiable disputes not settled by mediation, and any state resorting to war in violation of its pledge to arbitrate was to be branded as an "aggressor nation" and made an international outcast. This was a bold scheme, but the downfall of the then existing Labor Government in Great Britain resulted in the defeat of this proposal.

The Locarno Treaties applied the principle of compulsory arbitration to a limited area. These treaties were signed in 1925. Germany, on her part agreed with Belgium, France, Czechoslovakia, and Poland, to settle, by

[3] For an explanation of the term "compulsory" [illegible] chapter on "Organizing the World for Peace."

peaceful means "all disputes of every kind," not settled by the regular processes of diplomacy. Offensive war, as between Germany and these other countries, was absolutely and forever renounced. Moreover, Great Britain and Italy undertook to defend either France or Germany should either wantonly attack the other.

The United States, while not a member of the League or of the World Court, took a forward step in its arbitration policies when it signed on February 6, 1928, an arbitration treaty with France, in which no reference was made to such phrases as "national honor," "vital interests," and "independence." All questions, except those which involve domestic issues, the interests of third parties, the Monroe Doctrine, and the obligations of France under the League of Nations, are to be arbitrated under the terms of this treaty. The State Department has announced its desire to negotiate a similar type of arbitration treaty with all leading nations. Such were the developments leading up to the negotiation and ratification of the Pact of Paris. The first nation to propose the renunciation of war was France. M. Briand, on April 6, 1927, in an informal message to the American people stated that his country stood willing to outlaw war as between his own country and the United States. This suggestion was incorporated in a draft treaty submitted to the State Department on June 20, 1927. This treaty proposed that France and the United States shall "condemn recourse to war and renounce it respectively as an instrument of their national policy toward each other," and that the settlement of all disputes "shall never be sought except by pacific means." Secretary of State Kellogg, in his reply, proposed that efforts be made "to obtain the adherence of all of the principal powers of the world to a declaration renouncing war as an instrument of national policy." France agreed, and on April 13, 1928, the United States sent a tentative draft treaty to France, Great Britain, Germany, Italy, and Japan. In a remarkably short time each of these nations indicated its intention to participate in the proposed treaty. Invitations to adhere to the treaty were then sent to Australia, Canada, the Irish Free State, New Zealand, South Africa, India, Belgium, Poland, and Czechoslovakia. The final text of

the renunciation of war treaty was made public on June 25, 1928. The ceremony of signing the treaty took place in Paris on August 27, Secretary Kellogg, in person, signing for the United States. M. Briand, on this occasion, dedicated the signing of the treaty to "all the dead of the Great War."

On the same day the United States representatives in forty-eight nations presented invitations to the respective governments to accept the obligations and share in the benefits of the Pact of Paris. Acceptances were received in Washington at an amazing rate of speed. This historic treaty was ratified by the United States Senate on January 15, 1929, by a vote of 85 to 1. The other fourteen original signatory powers ratified in due time, as did the other governments invited to adhere, and on July 24, 1929, President Herbert Hoover solemnly declared the Paris Peace Pact for the renunciation of war to be in effect and binding upon all the signatory powers. M. Briand, preceding the signing of the Treaty in Paris, had said: "It may now be appropriate to explain what is finally the essential feature of this pact against war. It is this. For the first time in the face of the whole world through a solemn covenant involving the honor of great nations that all have behind them a heavy past of political conflict, war is renounced unreservedly as an instrument of national policy, that is to say, in its most specific and dreaded form, selfish and willful war. Considered of yore as of divine right and having remained in international ethics as an attribute of sovereignty, that form of war becomes at last juridically devoid of what constituted its most serious danger: its legitimacy." And President Hoover, in launching the treaty said: "I dare predict that the influence of this treaty for the renunciation of war will be felt in a large proportion of all future international acts. The magnificent opportunity and the compelling duty now open to us should spur us on to the fulfillment of every opportunity that is calculated to implement this treaty and to extend the policy which it so nobly set forth." In addition to the original fifteen signatory powers, thirty-six nations have adhered to this Pact, making it a practically universal renunciation of war.

To be sure, the negotiation and ratification of the Pact had been hedged about with a considerable number of qualifications and reservations. Secretary Kellogg had said, in the course of his diplomatic correspondence, "There is nothing in the American draft of an antiwar treaty which restricts or impairs in any way the right of self-defense. That right is inherent in every sovereign state and is implicit in every treaty." The French reply to this interpretation of the treaty was as follows: "Each [nation] in this respect will always remain free to defend its territory against attack or invasion." It was further held by Secretary Kellogg that "each state alone is competent to decide whether circumstances require recourse to war in self-defense." The foreign secretary of Great Britain, in making clear the position of his country, wrote to Secretary Kellogg: "It is desirable that I should remind your Excellency that there are certain regions of the world which constitute a special and vital interest for our peace and safety. His Majesty's government have been at pains to make it clear in the past that interference with these regions cannot be suffered. . . . It must be clearly understood that his Majesty's government in Great Britain accepts the new treaty upon the distinct understanding that it does not prejudice this freedom of action in this respect. . . ." Great Britain, it would seem, was formulating a Monroe Doctrine of her own.

Notwithstanding these and similar qualifying interpretations, the Pact of Paris stands as originally written and adhered to by the signatory nations. No reservations have been incorporated in the text of the treaty. As time goes on these so-called "interpretations" will be forgotten and only the simple and sublime text of the treaty will be remembered. In brief, the nations have declared that they "condemn recourse to war for the solution of their international controversies, and renounce it as an instrument of national policy in their relations with one another." They have solemnly agreed that "the settlement or solution of all disputes or conflicts, of whatever nature or of whatever origin they may be, which may arise among them, shall never be sought except by pacific means." They have further declared that "all changes in their relations with

one another should be sought only by pacific means and be the result of a peaceful and orderly process."

This Pact is the crowning glory of the new diplomacy. It incorporates the principle of constitutionalism in the relations of nations. It renounces the doctrine of absolute sovereignty. It takes away from the so-called sovereign state the right to declare war. It does not quibble about "national honor" nor does it lose itself in endless reference to those "spread-eagle" abstractions that were once the delight of the small-minded politician. This Pact was negotiated in the open. All the world knows the contents of this immortal document. It bears the imprint of the lofty idealism of the statesman as over against the clumsy mechanism of the militarist. It disavows the old theory of the "balance of power" and lays down a code of conduct applicable to all the civilized nations of the earth.

It now remains for this new diplomacy to supplement the Peace Pact of Paris with the political machinery indispensable to the pacific settlement of international controversies. To that task the statesmen of the world are now turning.

For Those Who Think

Describe the diplomacy of prewar days. Was this diplomacy a help or a hindrance to the achievement of the peace ideal?

What are "national sovereignty" and "national honor," and how may these political concepts be changed in order to advance the interests of world justice and peace?

Are nations amenable to the moral law?

Has the time come to renounce the political theory of the "balance of power"?

In what way does the World Court differ from the Hague Tribunal?

What obligations do the nations assume under the Peace Pact of Paris?

CHAPTER V

HUMANITARIANISM AND PEACE

MANY of the social evils of to-day are international in scope and must be dealt with internationally. Here we have another evidence of the trend toward world unity. Education is approaching its task from an international standpoint. So too are business, labor, religion, diplomacy, and science. The old piecemeal and localized method of handling the social problems of life is being abandoned. Men and nations are now internationalizing their common activities, and this tendency is nowhere more pronounced than in the new humanitarianism of recent years.

The world is nothing more than an enlarged neighborhood. The evils of the local community are the evils of the world, on an enlarged scale and in an aggravated form. The closer integration of the nations, politically, and in every other way, has made imperative the employment of new forces, on a world-wide scale, for the relief of those social maladjustments that threaten the moral integrity of the people of every land. As it has become necessary for nations to move forward collectively for the solution of political problems, so it has become necessary for peoples to move forward co-operatively for the solution of social problems. The bridging of the oceans and the spanning of the seas by the new science, bent on achieving the physical solidarity of the universe, has created a difficult situation for the humanitarian. There was a time when oceans and rivers and national boundaries acted as barriers to the trafficking in human life. That time has gone. The social evils of the nations are all bound up together and include such immoralities as the traffic in opium and other dangerous drugs, the traffic in women, the traffic in forced labor, the traffic in alcoholic beverages, and the traffic in obscene literature. The new humanitarianism has dedicated itself to the eradication of these festering world evils.

Then, too, there is a vast amount of humanitarian labor

that is not directed against vice, as such, but which has as its objective the social uplift of the peoples ministered unto. Among such activities are the caring of refugees, the relief of peoples overtaken by disaster, the protection of children, and the fighting of contagious diseases. This work of social and moral reconstruction, to succeed, must be undertaken on an international basis. The story is told of a city in one of the Southern States where it had been determined to improve the sewerage system in an effort to make the community immune against typhoid and other infectious diseases. The proud aristocrats of the city thought that it would be a needless waste of public funds to extend the contemplated conveniences down into the Negro district that had been carefully segregated from the neighborhood where the white folks lived. Accordingly, the whites protected themselves against disease, leaving the Negroes to provide for their health themselves. In a little while a typhus germ made its way among the blacks, and many deaths resulted. But the typhus germ, unmindful of color lines, spread over into the white man's neighborhood and reaped a pitiful toll of sickness and death, whereupon the sewerage disposal facilities were extended to the blacks as well as to the white. In like manner the infectious social diseases of one continent soon penetrate the social life of other continents. Social evils can no longer be localized.

It would be a gigantic piece of folly for any one nation to attempt the suppression of any one of the large number of social immoralities. The moral security of one nation depends upon the extent to which the common moralities of life are shared by all the other nations. And, incidentally, the bringing of various peoples together for the suppression of international vices and for social uplift strengthens the structure of peace and adds tremendously to the sum total of human happiness.

No nation has as yet entirely emancipated itself from the traffic in women. Prostitution is an international curse, a blight on the moral life of every people. It is believed by many that this greatest of the social immoralities will never be eradicated. It may not, but heroic efforts are now being made on a world scale, to do that very thing.

There can be no doubt as to the international dimensions of this particular vice. Girls and young women, twenty-five years of age and under, of every race and nationality, are often transported across national boundaries, and from one continent to another for the purposes of prostitution. Sometimes these girls take up this scarlet trail on their own initiative. At other times they are drugged and forced into a life of unspeakable shame. Unscrupulous individuals, ready to debauch womanhood for their own private gain, commercialize virtue the world over.

Sporadic efforts were made prior to the Great War to stamp out this scourge. Conferences were held in Paris in 1902 and 1910, to which the United States was a party. The international agreements resulting from these conferences largely failed of their purpose. Then the war came. As in the case of every military struggle, impetus is given to social corruption of every sort, and the white-slave traffic during the days of the war fastened its tentacles still more firmly on an exhausted soldier and civilian population. It soon became evident, after the war was over, that the traffic in women could not be stopped without the moral co-operation of the nations. Accordingly, an International Conference on White Slave Traffic was held in Geneva in 1921, participated in by the representatives of thirty-five states. An international convention was negotiated at that time which aimed at strengthening the provisions of the earlier agreements and at making more severe the penalties imposed upon the organizers of the traffic. Whereas the previous conventions had been signed by only thirteen governments, there are already thirty-six signatories to this particular document. The provisions of the 1910 convention were continued, by which states undertake "to punish any person debauching either a woman or girl, even with her consent, with a view to commercializing her, though the various acts are accomplished in different countries; to communicate their respective laws to each other and to provide special means of extraditing culprits under the convention."[1] The parties to the 1921 convention also agree "to take appropriate measures for guarding the licensing and supervision of employment agencies and

[1] *Nine Years of the League of Nations*, p. 137. World Peace Foundation.

offices so as to insure the protection of women and children seeking employment in another country," and, in connection with immigration and emigration, "to adopt such measures as are required to check the traffic in women and children and to set up special means of protection at points of departure and arrival."[2] In 1922 the Council of the League constituted an Advisory Committee on the Traffic in Women and Children. This committee, including a representative of the United States, initiated in 1923 a searching inquiry into the extent and methods of operation of the white-slave traffic. A small number of trained experts studied conditions in twenty-eight different countries in Europe, Latin America, and North Africa. The final report of the committee, as presented to the Council in 1927, was based on information supplied by governments, and on factual data unearthed by the investigators in their personal interviews with more than sixty-five hundred persons, about five thousand of whom were connected with commercialized prostitution. It was discovered that the "main routes" of the traffic run from such countries as France, Austria, Greece, Italy, Spain, Turkey, Germany, Poland, and Roumania, to many nations, more particularly to different South American countries and to Egypt. It was shown, on the basis of information furnished by some of the Latin-American governments, that as many as eighty per cent of the girls registered as prostitutes in their respective territories are of foreign origin. Only the force of an enlightened morality of world scope can bring this international criminality to an end. Nations acting alone are helpless in the presence of this gigantic evil. Their hands are tied. There is reasonable ground for optimism, however, in concerted action. Efforts are now being made, with the active support of as many as thirty-six governments, to put into effect the reforms recommended by the League's Advisory Committee, reforms such as the more rigorous supervision of all passports for girls claiming to be employed in theatrical enterprises, the elimination of the third party who stands to profit as the traffic is extended, and the raising of the legal age for marriage, inasmuch as girls, married at the low age of twelve years, are often deserted

[2] *Ibid.*

by their husbands when they arrive at the country of their destination. An international public opinion is also being developed for the first time in history, against the licensing of prostitutes within the boundaries of each given country. The whole licensed-house system is now under attack. Arguments have been advanced that this phase of the problem is a purely domestic question, but the Ninth Assembly of the League supported the Advisory Committee's request that "the governments of all those countries which still retain the licensed-house system will investigate the question as soon as possible." The international traffic has been inseparably linked with the licensed-house system, and public opinion has decreed that the latter must be outlawed before the former can be overcome.

Child welfare is coming to be recognized as a matter of international action. The Fifth Assembly ratified the action of the Council in placing the activities of the International Association for the Promotion of Child Welfare under the direction of the League's Secretariat. This same Assembly also invited states, members of the League, to be guided by the principles of the "Declaration of Geneva," which reads: "By the present Declaration of the Rights of the Child, commonly known as the Declaration of Geneva, men and women of all nations, recognizing that mankind owes to the child the best that it has to give, declare and accept it as their duty that, beyond and above all considerations of race, nationality, or creed, the child must be given the means requisite for its normal development, both materially and spiritually; the child that is hungry must be fed, the child that is sick must be helped, the delinquent child must be reclaimed, and the orphan and waif must be sheltered and succored; the child must be the first to receive relief in times of distress; the child must be put in a position to earn a livelihood and must be protected against every form of exploitation; the child must be brought up in the consciousness that its talents must be devoted to the service of its fellow men."[3] The moral and social dangers to children, in keeping with this Declaration, are being studied internationally.

One of the most significant activities of this new humani-

[3] *Nine Years of the League of Nations*, pp. 140–141. World Peace Foundation.

tarianism is that of the suppression of the opium traffic. The illicit traffic in dangerous drugs has long been looked upon as an international evil. It is recognized that so long as the private manufacturers of separate nations are free to produce and export as much as they like of these drugs, it will be well-nigh impossible for other nations to protect themselves against an illicit traffic carried on by unscrupulous traders. The difficulties of stamping out the use of drugs, except for medical and scientific purposes, are many. Large quantities of forbidden drugs may be packed into very small bulk and easily smuggled through the customs. Drugs are sold at a tremendous profit, and this financial inducement is a lure to many who are constantly studying ways and means of outwitting governments as they ply their trade.

To combat this practically world-wide system of illicit traffic an International Conference met at The Hague in 1912. Steps were taken to control the production of dangerous drugs. Progress under the program agreed to at that time proved to be slow and unsatisfactory. When the League of Nations was instituted it was provided, in Article 23 of the Covenant, that, "the members of the League (c) will intrust the League with the general supervision over the execution of agreements with regard to . . . the traffic in opium and other dangerous drugs." World-wide agreement to the 1912 Opium Convention was then sought by the League, and in a short time fifty-one of the fifty-four League members became parties to this agreement. An Advisory Committee on the Traffic in Opium and Other Dangerous Drugs was appointed by the Council at the request of the Assembly in 1921. Fourteen countries, including the United States, are represented on this committee, which as soon as it came into existence issued a questionnaire to all governments in an effort to determine the extent of the world's needs of manufactured drugs for scientific and medicinal purposes. This information was sought in order to afford a basis for judging the extent of the illicit traffic.

After three years of research two opium conferences were held in 1924-25. The first conference aimed at the gradual suppression of the use of prepared opium, an agreement

being reached whereby the signatory powers agreed to suppress entirely within a fifteen-year period the consumption of prepared opium in the territories under their authority. It was understood that this period of restriction was to begin just as soon as the poppy-growing countries had insured the effective execution of the necessary measures to prevent the clandestine exportation of raw opium from their territories from constituting a serious obstacle to the reduction of consumption in the countries where the use of prepared opium was temporarily authorized.

Forty-one governments, including the United States, sent representatives to the second of these conferences, called to consider the whole question of the production, manufacture, and control of narcotic drugs, and the convention of which, signed at Geneva, February 19, 1925, came into force September 25, 1928. This convention provides for the enactment of laws and regulations looking toward the effective control of production, distribution, and export of raw opium, and the limitation of the localities of export or import of raw opium on coca leaves. Each country is required to make known to the Permanent Central Board, in advance, its annual needs of drugs for medicinal, scientific, and other legitimate purposes. The Permanent Central Board is authorized to check up on the undue accumulation of drugs in any country, and explanations from the countries in question may be asked for through the secretary-general of the League. International trade is brought under world control by a system of export authorizations and import certificates.

Prior to the coming into effect of this convention a Commission of Inquiry on Opium Production in Persia visited that country in 1926 to determine the possibility of substituting other crops for the opium poppy. The report of the commission made several recommendations for the replacement of the poppy and outlined a scheme for irrigation and the transport of agricultural commodities. The Persian government stated that it would accept the recommendations of the commission subject to reconsideration after three years. The principle of stewardship in the moral affairs of the nations has thus been vindicated. The strong are bearing the burdens of the weak, and all to-

gether are co-operating for the suppression of a traffic that has wrecked the bodies and damned the souls of countless thousands of men and women. The United States government, while withdrawing from the 1925 Conference and refusing to appoint a member to the Permanent Central Board, has assured the authorities in Geneva that it would continue to observe its commitments under the earlier Hague Convention and would furnish such information as the Permanent Central Board may require.

This new humanitarianism is seeking to abolish forced labor the world over. Tens of thousands of the natives in Africa, Asia, and elsewhere are still suffering from the bondage of human servitude. The polite name for this modern form of slavery is "forced labor," but it is slavery, none the less. It is all the more reprehensible because of the name under which it masquerades. Greek democracy, despite its claims to social superiority, was based upon the existence of a slave class. In much the same way the industrialism of Western nations has thrived upon the forced labor of native populations. Whole villages of native men, women, and children have been dragged into the machine of Western industrialism under conditions bordering on slavery. The "forced labor" of backward peoples has stood for decades as a serious indictment of the alleged splendors of Occidental civilization. Many of the commodities that enter into the daily comfort of Europeans and Americans have been produced under labor conditions that would not be tolerated at home. Under the Mandate System of the League forced labor has been permitted for "essential public works and service." The terms "essential" and "service" have been made to cover all forms of human bondage. Such "service" has too often resulted in untold economic benefit to Western capitalism and to the social and economic impoverishment of the native laborers.

The conscience of the world is now coming to believe that forced labor cannot be justified, no matter how "essential" the products of that labor may be deemed to be. The humanitarian, keenly aware of the oneness of moral problems in a shrinking universe, has resolved to rid the world of this distressing social evil. The Permanent Mandates Commission of the League, as an initial step toward that

end, sent to all states in 1922 a questionnaire respecting the existence of slavery. On the basis of the data thus secured the Assembly, in 1926, negotiated a slavery convention which entered into force in 1927. This convention extends and amplifies the provisions of the Brussels Act of 1889 in which slavery is defined as the "status or condition of any person over whom any or all the powers attaching to the right of ownership are exercised." The signatories to this convention undertake to prevent and suppress the slave trade in territories under their control and to bring about, as quickly as possible, the complete abolition of slavery in all its forms. Rules restricting the use of forced labor are laid down. Nations, parties to this convention, have agreed to adopt the legislative measures necessary to bring this antislavery legislation into effect, and to send reports to the secretary-general of the League regarding the execution of the provisions of the treaty. The United States Senate, on February 25, 1929, voted to adhere to this convention.

Still other inhuman conditions of labor prevail throughout the world that challenge the concern of humanitarianism. In the Southwest African mines, for example, where between five and six thousand natives are employed, the death rate has been known to run as high as ten or eleven per cent per year. Again, on the railroad in the French Cameroons, the death rate of native laborers has been as high as twelve per cent a year. The Mandates Commission of the League, with an aroused public opinion of world dimensions to support its efforts, has set out to put an end to these frightful conditions. Remarkable results have already been achieved. The mortality among laborers in Southwest Africa has been cut down from ten to four per cent and in the French Cameroons from twelve to three and four per cent. The cause of these down-trodden natives has become the concern of the entire world. Once required to suffer in obscurity, these dark-skinned natives from afar are now reaping the social benefits of a humanitarianism which, like education, diplomacy, business, and religion, has become world-wide in the scope of its activities and influence.

An international approach is now being made to the

problem of suppressing the traffic in obscene publications. At the invitation of France there was convened, in 1923, an International Conference for the Suppression of the Circulation of and Traffic in Obscene Publications. Questionnaires had been sent to all states prior to the convening of the conference. On the basis of this data a convention was negotiated and signed at Geneva September 12, 1923, by the representatives of forty-three states. This convention, which came into force on August 4, 1924, provides that the contracting parties are to designate an authority to centralize information to aid in repressing infringements of their municipal laws as to obscene matter, "the constitutive elements of which bear an international character"; to supply all information tending to check the importation and to expedite the seizure of such matter; and, to communicate to each other all laws applicable to the subject.[4] This convention makes it a punishable offense to make or produce or have in possession obscene writings, drawings, printed matter, photographs, and films, by way of trade, for export, for distribution, or public exhibition; to import, or export, to carry on or take part in any business, public or private, or to advertise or make known anyone engaged in such activity.[5]

Never before have so many iniquitous traffics fallen under the ban of the international reformer. The traffic in women and children, in opium and other dangerous drugs, in forced labor, and in obscene publications, one and all, has weakened under the weight of an indignant and universal morality. Nations are being summoned to the bar of public opinion to give cause why these evils should not forthwith be made obsolete, especially in a world where the ends of the earth have been brought together and where a social sin in one country is more than likely to infect the social life of another country.

The touch of this international humanitarianism has also brought healing to the refugees of the World War. The love labors of the Near East Relief might well be regarded as a New Testament story of Samaritan Friendship. About twelve million mouths were fed and approximately

[4] *Nine Years of the League of Nations*, p. 144. World Peace Foundation.
[5] *A Short History of the League of Nations*, p. 7. League of Nations Association.

one and a half million lives were saved as a result of this heroic effort to minister unto those who were sick and in need. When, after the abortive effort of General Wrangle, in 1921, to overthrow the Bolshevik regime, and thousands upon thousands of refugees were pouring into Latvia, Poland, Bulgaria, and Turkey, the League of Nations was called upon to serve in the rôle of the Big Brother to these broken and bruised Russians. The League appointed Doctor Nansen, the world-renowned arctic explorer, as its high commissioner to go into these stricken areas on an errand of mercy. Doctor Nansen fed and clothed the refugees. He provided them with work after having learned from the various nations as to the amount of labor they could receive. He persuaded the Czechoslovakian government to be responsible for the care and protection of one thousand students, while the Bulgarian government agreed to become sponsors for the feeding and educating of five thousand children. Others were sent to more distant countries, where they were given assurances of a happy and peaceful home life, and still others were returned to Russia after guarantees for their protection had been secured.

Again, in 1922, 1,500,000 Greek men, women, and children became the victims of the ill will then existing between that country and Turkey. It has been estimated that hundreds of thousands of Greek civilians were obliged to leave their homes, without a solitary possession, seeking safety elsewhere with the hope that some way would be found whereby they might return to their native land. Once again the League intervened. Doctor Nansen, with the financial help placed at his disposal by several nations, organized a system of relief and of social reconstruction that has been one of the humanitarian miracles of the present century.

Prior to these particular accomplishments the League had been instrumental in solving the problem of the repatriation of 430,000 war prisoners of twenty-six different nations, all of whom were returned to their homes at an average cost of less than five dollars per person. After the Russian and Greek emergencies already referred to had been taken care of there still remained the task of providing

for 300,000 Armenian refugees. This was done. In 1926 a scheme for the relief of 52,000 Bulgarian families was worked out by leaders of this new world humanitarianism. In 1928 there were some 15,000 Assyrians and Assyro-Chaldeans in southern Russia in dire need of physical and economic resuscitation. They were ministered unto, as were thousands of other Assyrians residing in Iraq and Syria. This Samaritan labor could not have been undertaken by any single nation. It was made possible only by the organized good will of the nations of the earth. So pronounced has been this tendency toward relief on an international scale that a convention and statute, dated July 12, 1927, brought into existence an International Relief Union which will operate "for the benefit of all stricken peoples regardless of race, nationality, or political or religious considerations." The Union aims to have on hand sufficient funds to come to the immediate rescue of populations in distress. Another function of the Union will be to co-ordinate the efforts of the various relief organizations such as the Red Cross Societies. This Union has already been approved, in principle, by twenty-one governments.

Closely allied with these relief activities are the efforts now being made by this new humanitarianism to improve the health and physical well-being of the nations. International co-operation has become a reality in the interest of public health. The members of the League are pledged to "endeavor to take steps in matters of international concern for the prevention and control of disease," and to make this pledge effective a Permanent Health Organization has been set up in Geneva. In 1920 a plague of typhus that began in Russia and spread over into Poland, threatened to engulf the whole of Europe. The Public Health authorities of Poland asked the League for aid in an effort to check the further progress of this dread disease. A number of highly trained doctors were sent into the disease infected areas. Sanitary cordons were established, isolating, in this manner, the infected regions. Hospitals were set up for the sick, and training centers for the doctors, and in a little while the plague had spent its force. The European Health Conference, convened at a later date at Warsaw, was the

first co-ordinated effort ever made by governments as such to fight epidemics and the spread of disease. Conventions were adopted which provided for the mutual notification of cases of cholera, plague, relapsing fever, and typhus. Medical inspection, disinfection, the segregation of infected persons, and other similar measures are to be taken by the health authorities within areas defined as centers of infection. Adequate inspection and examination, as well as prophylactic methods are to be exercised on the land and maritime frontiers with a view to preventing the spread of epidemic diseases, and the authorities of adjacent countries undertake to assist each other in these respects.[6]

Realizing that the great plagues which afflict mankind generally start in the Far East and spread westward, the Health Commission of the League instituted the Eastern Bureau of the Health Organization at Singapore, on March 1, 1925. Information regarding the existence of diseases in more than one hundred and forty ports is broadcast in a code message every Friday from the wireless stations at Saigon, Indo-China, Bandoeng, Dutch East Indies, and by telegraph from Geneva to one hundred and twenty-four public health administrations throughout the world.[7] Supplemental and more detailed reports are sent by mail. The collection and distribution on a world scale of this epidemic information represents a high piece of humanitarian endeavor. Internationally organized commissions have now been created to study such diseases as malaria, tuberculosis, and cancer. International studies have been made of infant mortality and of tropical diseases.

This new humanitarianism is creating, in its own dynamic way, the will to peace. Nations are beginning to see that there is such a thing as a patriotism of mutual service. By helping one another in times of disaster nations are strengthening the bonds of good will that will yet bind the peoples of the earth together. By combating the social evils common to all, each nation is doing its full share in cultivating that sense of comradeship out of which peace emerges. And, finally, by giving witness to the unity of mankind, this new humanitarianism makes

[6] *Nine Years of the League of Nations*, p. 102. World Peace Foundation.
[7] *Ibid.*

more apparent than ever the need of serving one another in peace rather than of killing one another in war. Nations, no less than individuals, are capable of responding to acts of courtesy and of kindness. This new world-wide humanitarianism is creating within the breast of every nation a sense of nobility that will make the consummation of ultimate peace more probable and the coming of another great war less likely.

For Those Who Think

What is the new humanitarianism doing to abolish such international vices as the traffic in women and children, the traffic in opium and other dangerous drugs, and the traffic in forced labor?

Can these vices be suppressed through the action of individual nations?

Name a few of the social activities of the League of Nations.

In what way do the activities of this new humanitarianism tend to promote the spirit of international justice and good will?

CHAPTER VI

SCIENCE AND PEACE

THE Graf Zeppelin completed its 20,000-mile world flight when it arrived at Lakehurst, New Jersey, on the morning of the twenty-ninth of August, 1929. Leaving Lakehurst on August 7 with a passenger list of 16 and a crew of 33, the biggest airship ever navigated flew to Friederichshafen, Germany, a distance of 4,200 miles, on the first lap of its round-the-world flight, in 55 hours and 24 minutes. The Graf Zeppelin clipped off the 6,800 miles between Friederichshafen and Tokio in 101 hours and 53 minutes. The 5,500 miles between Tokio and Los Angeles were covered in 78 hours and 58 minutes. The flight from Los Angeles back to Lakehurst, a distance of 3,500 miles, was made in 51 hours and 51 minutes. The globe-trotting Zeppelin had flown 20,000 miles in a total flying time of 288 hours and 6 minutes, or 12 days and 6 minutes, with a total elapsed time of 21 days, 7 hours, and 26 minutes. Leaving Lakehurst again on September 1, the Graf Zeppelin arrived at its base in Germany making the world round trip from Friederichshafen in 20 days and 4 hours.

The dramatic girdling of the world by this lighter-than-air craft illustrates the manner in which the nations are being drawn together by the hand of science. Distances are being annihilated in these days. Magellan, the first circumnavigator of the globe, put to sea in 1519 with five ships, only one of which returned to its home port and then only after a perilous journey of three years. Then came Drake. Globe-circling had come into its own. Jules Verne, in 1872, published his *Around the World in Eighty Days,* and everybody gently classified him as an idiot. Verne, in this romance, pictured his mythical Phineas Fogg traveling by way of Suez, Bombay, Calcutta, Hongkong, San Francisco, and New York, making use of sledges, elephants, trains, and steamers, in a desperate, but successful effort to set an around-the-world mark of 80 days.

Nelly Bly, in 1889, actually lowered the mythical record of Phineas Fogg by some eight days, completing her adventure in seventy-two days. This record did not stand very long. Science had intervened. Making use of the airplane in conjunction with other modes of travel, Edward S. Evans and Linton Wells circled the globe in 1926 in 28 days, 14½ hours. The Mears-Collyer Around-the-World Expedition, two years later, established a new record of 23 days, 15 hours and 21 minutes. Then came the Graf Zeppelin, completing a Friederichshafen to Friederichshafen trip in 20 days and 4 hours.

The shrinkage of the physical universe since the days of Magellan, Drake, Columbus, and Vasco de Gama has proceeded at an amazing pace. This has been accomplished through the digging of canals, the construction of fast ocean-going vessels, express trains, and lighter-than-air machines. The digging of the Panama Canal, for example, considerably shortened the lanes of world travel. The distance from New York to San Francisco, via the Straits of Magellan, is 13,135 miles, but via the Panama Canal it is only 5,262 miles. Similarly, the distance from Galveston, by the same route, was cut from 13,727 to 4,787 miles, while the distance from Galveston to Yokohama was cut from 14,575 to 9,323 miles. The distance from San Francisco to Liverpool, via the Straits of Magellan is 13,502 miles, via the Panama Canal 7,836 miles. The traveler from New York to Sydney, Australia, via the Suez, Colombo, and Melbourne, covers a distance of 14,148 miles, but his journey through the Panama Canal is only 9,811 miles. The digging of the Canal had the effect of bringing Europe, the Orient, Australia, and the North and South American continents into close contact with one another.

These distances were further diminished by the development and continued improvement of aircraft. It was in 1783 when the first aerial voyage made by man took place. This was in a fire-balloon, the work of Stephen and Joseph Montgolfier, of France. Then came the gas balloon. The first crossing of the English channel by air was in 1795. The Zeppelin airships, developed by Count Ferdinand von Zeppelin, began appearing in 1891, and in 1924 Dr. Hugo Eckener piloted the ZR3 from Friederichs-

hafen to New York. In the meantime, in 1900, the Curtis brothers were experimenting with their glider on the Atlantic Coast, off North Carolina. There they laid the foundations of aerial navigation. The first crossing of the Atlantic by air was made in 1919 by the NC4, a Navy-Curtiss plane. The air route from London to Australia was then conquered by British airmen. Soon afterward a Vickers-Vimy plane was piloted from Cairo to Cape Town. A nonstop flight across America was made in 1922. Then came a number of explorations by aircraft in polar regions. The first flight around the world was accomplished in 1924. The nonstop flight of Colonel Charles A. Lindbergh from New York to Paris, in 1927, made Americans and Europeans neighbors. Late in the same year America's "Ambassador of Good Will," as Colonel Lindbergh had come to be known, made a nonstop flight from Washington, D. C., to Mexico City, where he was received amidst the plaudits of thirty thousand spectators. From Mexico Colonel Lindbergh visited a number of Central American countries and Cuba, cementing the ties of friendship between his own and fifteen Latin-American nations. The Pacific Ocean was next bridged when the monoplane, the Southern Cross, was piloted from Oakland to Honolulu, to the Figi Islands, to Australia, a total distance of seventy-eight hundred miles. The Bremen, a German plane, negotiated the dangerous westward passage over the Atlantic in 1928. Then followed in rapid succession the flight of Wilkins and of the Italian airship Norge in the North Polar regions, the Byrd expedition to the south pole, and the world flight of the Graf Zeppelin. It is now being estimated that within a few years three hundred miles an hour will represent a normal rate of speed. How the universe shrinks!

Radio has done its full share in accomplishing the annihilation of space and time. In 1858 the United States and England were joined together by the miracle of electricity. In that year the first cable was laid. The stretching of these slender wires under two thousand miles of ocean brought the Englishman and the American face to face. In 1876 Bell invented the telephone, and distances were mocked at afresh. The continued development of

electrical communications has shriveled the universe. It is doubtful if anything in all history has so profoundly affected the social life of humanity as has the radio. The United States to-day is in daily wireless communication with twenty-five countries. A direct wireless service has now been established by the Radio Corporation of America between New York City and England, France, Germany, Italy, Holland, Belgium, Sweden, Norway, Poland, Turkey, Argentine, Brazil, Colombia, Venezuela, Porto Rico, Dutch Guiana, and Portugal. San Francisco is now the center of a network which reaches out to China, Japan, the Philippines, Dutch East Indies, and French Indo-China. A good-will message is sent annually to the children of Japan by the children of Wales, relayed by way of the Eiffel Tower, Paris. Frequent messages are sent from the United States and other countries to Captain Byrd at the south pole. Hundreds of thousands of Americans "listened in" at the service recently held in Westminster Abbey, London, in commemoration of the restoration to health of King George V. Premier MacDonald speaks from the rostrum of the League of Nations, and his message of peace is relayed to the ends of the earth. General J. G. Harbord was speaking the gospel of truth when he said, "And so the radio industry in America has played a major rôle, not only in the development of a national consciousness in our own people, but also in the cosmopolitan consciousness of the world at large. More than the peace conferences of history, it [radio] has served to make the concept of 'Peace on Earth, Good Will toward Men' a reality, and taking the world by the hand has led it one big step farther down that shadowy trail that ends in Utopia."[1]

Nor is that all. Radio telephony has made possible a trans-oceanic telephone service. Already we have succeeded in establishing transatlantic telephone connections with England, Germany, Holland, Belgium, Sweden, and other Continental countries. And the end is not yet. Photo-radiograms are now flashing news, documents, and photographs across seas, deserts, oceans, and continents.

[1] *The Radio Industry*, p. 96. McGraw-Hill Book Company, publishers, New York. Reprinted by permission.

We are now entering an era of radio television, and scientists assure us that within a relatively short time a panorama of world happenings will be brought to the hearthstone of every home. It is generally agreed that we are just at the beginning of this scientific girdling of the earth. What the end will be no man can prophesy. One thing is certain, however, the world will be smaller to-morrow than it is to-day. Already the "splendid isolation" so frequently referred to by the late Senator Lodge has been relegated to the realm of fiction. There is no isolation in this world, political, social or spiritual.

Medical research has now become a world activity. The Pasteur Institute of Paris, the Rockefeller Institute of New York, and the London Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine are centers of an international medical service. Disease germs know no boundary lines. Similarly, the combating of these germs and the promotion of the world's health are regarded, everywhere, as matters of international concern. The first European conference to consider health problems was held in 1851. At that time the cholera plague and yellow fever were regarded as a world menace, and the science of medicine was organized, internationally, to stem the progress of these diseases. An International Sanitary Bureau was established in Washington in 1902 under the administrative direction of the Pan-American Union, and in 1908 an International Office of Hygiene was set up in Paris. And now we have the health organization of the League of Nations, supported by fifty-four nations, initiating a campaign of far-reaching dimensions to improve the world's health.

Practically every science known to man is in the thrilling game of fashioning a new universe. A large proportion of the nearly one hundred international conferences convened every year is concerned with one or another aspect of this new science which recognizes neither boundary lines nor racial cleavages.

An International Engineers' Congress was held in Japan in 1929. These engineers believe that their own particular science is in a strategic position to hasten the coming of peace. They are not interested solely in the development of horse-power, in the building of bridges and railroads

and the digging of mines. They see in these activities, projected on an international scale, the bridging of mind as well as of matter. Announcement has just recently been made that we are to have an international "weather man." France, Germany, Great Britain, and the United States are planning to co-operate in ascertaining the whereabouts and the wherefores of meteorological conditions over the North Atlantic. These four nations are planning to obtain from ships and to exchange among themselves radio reports "from all sectors of the weather front." This composite picture of rain and shine is to be pieced together every twelve hours. The representatives of thirty-six nations formed a world-wide forestry union at Stockholm in the summer of 1929. Two hundred delegates co-operated in the establishment of a "Union of Institutes of Forestry Research," with headquarters in Sweden. This Union will collaborate with the International Agricultural Institute of Rome in the furtherance of its program.

Scientific information is being relayed around the world for the benefit of each and all. Who ever heard of an American science, or a German, a French, or an Italian science? Many international bureaus and institutes of research have been organized since the World War for the furtherance of scientific ends. Scientists move freely from one continent to another in quest of knowledge. They travel to observatories and laboratories, near and far, to study an eclipse, to diagnose a disease, to study plant and animal life. Even the insects are not beyond the reach of the co-operative science of the present day. The cotton boll-weevil, the gypsy moth, and the Mediterranean fly are combated internationally. This constant intermingling of engineers, psychologists, sociologists, astronomers, and metallurgists has pushed out the boundaries of human understanding. An eminent scientist, in testifying to the unifying influence of this new creative intelligence, said: "Statesmen may cut up continents into countries, but science knows no nationality. Ideas will somehow leak through from one language to another. Print and picture will penetrate anywhere. The map may be colored like a crazy quilt, but nobody can put up partitions in ether. The frontier may be lined with soldiers, the radio will

overreach them. The three-mile limit of the high seas has ceased to have meaning. The self-propelled projectile, the auto-airplane, carrying death in its bombs, has no limit to its range. No wall, trench, or barbed-wire fence can shut out the molecules of poison gas. The airplane soars over customhouses. The submarine dives under blockades. The automobile runs across tariff walls. Science erases the artificial barriers that the politician erects. As the world comes under the sway of science political divisions will be impossible to maintain."[2]

Biology, psychology, and philosophy are laying an intellectual foundation for this approaching world solidarity. Biologists, at one time stood confused in the presence of the infinite variations of human life. Attempts were made to perpetuate the divisions of mankind on scientific grounds. That attempt has been given up. It is now seen that the differences of race and color are due to accidents of birth, of environment, of climate and soil. The new biology, therefore, is arriving at its conclusions through a general acceptance of the fact that the human race, despite racial differentiation, roots back in a common source. Different names are still given to different peoples, and there is to-day, as before, a scientific classification of the physiological disparities of Orientals and Occidentals. That classification will go on, but biology has definitely ceased pigeonholing the various races as though they had been predestined to remain apart. It is now recognized that the blood of a common humanity flows through the veins of each and all. Irrespective of physiological cleavages the oneness of humanity remains. The emphasis of that sovereign truth is biology's contribution to the world's peace.

Psychologists are pouring the oil of understanding on the swiftly moving waters of our international life. Mechanical science has brought the nations together and psychology is rationalizing this physical cohesiveness of the universe in terms of a mental like-mindedness. Men could once draw upon their imagination to accentuate the alleged differences of peoples and to exaggerate their intellectual

[2] Caldwell and Slosson, *Science Remaking the World*, p. 30. Doubleday, Doran and Company, publishers. Reprinted by permission.

peculiarities. That can no longer be done. Psychology, in penetrating into the mysteries of conscience and of conduct, has revealed the truth that all men share in common certain elemental experiences. The existence of each is, in a measure, bound up with the destiny of all. The realization of this fact is conducive to neighborliness. In tearing down the mental partitions that have divided racial and national groups the psychologist merits the title of peacemaker. The International Congress of Psychology, at its 1929 meeting at Yale University, considered the place of the scientist in the making of peace. The president of the Congress, Dr. J. McKeen Cattell, in urging his colaborers to work for peace, said: "When in the fullness of time there is a family of the nations, when each will give according to its ability and receive according to its needs, when war among them will be as absurd as it would now be for members of this congress to begin murdering one another, this will be due in no small measure to co-operation among scientific men of all nations in their common work. And it may be that psychology, the child among the sciences, and the United States, the child among the nations, shall lead them. Psychology, not less than other sciences, perhaps more than any one of them, is concerned with problems of human welfare: the nation, the family, schools, churches, courts, prisons, armies, navies—these are all institutions which aim by emotional and rule-of-thumb methods to alter individuals and to control their behavior. When we have knowledge and understanding concerning institutions and individuals and learn how to apply knowledge and understanding for their betterment, it will be a product of a science of psychology."

The philosophers are adding their influence to the development of the peace ideal. Philosophy, like psychology, once dealt in abstractions. It had little, if any, touch of the human. It was purely speculative and without social value. Philosophers are now disposed to look facts in the face. They are pragmatists. The test of their philosophy is its workability in concrete situations. In turning from his speculations and theories the philosopher applies himself to the solution of practical everyday problems. Does war work out for the good of humanity? Does an exces-

sive and unrestrained nationalism conduce to world happiness? Does a competitive militarism diminish or increase the prospects for peace? The philosopher wants to know these things. He delves into the reasons lying behind the social maladjustments of his environment. In other words, philosophy is being socialized, a tendency that cannot but work out for the uplift of humanity.

The question emerges as to whether or not chemistry, in making more effective the instruments of war, is undermining the more constructive influences of the other sciences. That question must be answered negatively. Chemistry, in the development of poison gases, and in the development of other methods of human torture, is helping, not hindering the cause of peace. By showing the possible and potential horrors of war, this particular science is stiffening the moral resistance of humanity against the recurrence of armed conflict. What are these instruments of torture against which mankind revolts? Chemical concoctions, such as chloropterin, phosgene, hydrocyanic acid, and mustard gas, are capable of achieving the wholesale destruction of civilian as well as combatant populations. "The traditional distinction between combatants and noncombatants," we are told, "is nonexistent in the future. The present-day bomber, with its bomb-load of 9,000 pounds, its crew of six, and mountings for ten machine-guns, its ability to carry one 4,000 pound bomb and two 2,000 pound bombs, can, and will, in squadron formation, rake over an enemy territory, discharging the high explosives first and then leaving the poison gas contents to linger and finish at their own time those remaining."[3] General P. R. C. Groves, director of Air Operations for the British Air Force, is authority for the statement that chemical warfare from the air might cause the loss of millions of lives within a few hours after an attack upon such centers as Paris or London and that it would be impossible to devise means for protecting the population against such an attack.[4] Realizing the truth of this the International Red Cross issued in 1928 to its

[3] Elvira K. Fradkin, *Chemical Warfare—Its Possibilities and Probabilities.* Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
[4] *Idem.*, p. 188.

national members, for recommendation and adoption, the following:[5] "That the Red Cross will open an international competition with a prize for a design of the most effective type of war gas proof shelter; that precautions to provide security against gas attacks be taken throughout the territory of all nations, since there is no knowing where an attack will be made; advising the creation of shelters of the only invulnerable type thus far produced, which is a hermetically sealable subterranean chamber supplied with chemically produced oxygen or filtered air from a high chimney ventilation operated by a powerful motor . . . these shelters should contain stocks of chemicals for neutralizing the atmosphere, like chloride of lime and permanganate of potash, which, in case of penetration of the shelter by gas could be pulverized by a machine. . . . Each community should be provided with a hermetically sealed van with stores of oxygen for removing the gassed."

It is not the rabid pacifist who sees in chemical warfare the possible destruction of the human race. It is the scientist, the humanitarian, and the military technician who see in these gases and poisonous smokes the end of civilization. Science has created a war weapon so destructive of human life that resort to it would be an indication of mass insanity. Reference might also be made to the military use of the airplane without pilot, guided by radio, carrying not only poison gases, but disease germs as well. Incendiary bombs, capable of generating a heat of 1,000 degrees, are also being stored away on the shelves of the militarists' laboratories. Speaking before the American Chemical Society, Mr. Francis P. Garvan, recipient of the Priestly Medal for distinguished military service in chemistry, expressed the opinion that the dread possibilities of modern chemistry in combination with aeronautics have made war impossible.[6] In amplifying his views Mr. Garvan said: "I am convinced that in case of modern war between great powers it would be foolish and useless for any battleship or cruiser to leave its dock or any army to take the field. Should not the terrible powers of chemistry, as we know them, and its war messengers, the airplane, on sea and on

[5] *Idem.*, p. 178.
[6] New York Times, September 12, 1920, p. 6.

land, strengthen the effort to safeguard the peace of the world by treaties and by agreements? Should not the dread possibilities of chemistry rule out the politicians and give to research in chemistry, in the other sciences and in medicine, a fraction of the huge cost of navies and armies created to destroy life and property?" Mr. Garvan concluded by saying: "The Chemical Foundation stands ready to bear all the expenses of any Commission the President may care to appoint to inquire into the vast possibilities of chemistry as an agent of peace, outlawing war by its terrors, advancing health and prosperity by its humane discoveries." General Pershing, in a letter to Senator Borah, December 10, 1926, wrote: "To sanction the use of gas in any form would be to open the way for the use of the most deadly gases and the possible poisoning of whole populations of noncombatant men, women, and children. The contemplation of such a result is shocking to the senses. It is unthinkable that civilization should deliberately decide upon such a course."

The contemplation of the appalling possibilities of chemical warfare has made peacemakers of tens of thousands of people the world over. Chemical science, by preparing for war, has paved the way toward peace. This may be arguing backward, but it is less difficult to believe that having made these instruments of torture mankind will refrain from using them than it is to believe that men are foolish enough to sign not only their own death warrant, but that of the human race as well. The Preparatory Disarmament Commission, sitting at Geneva, has adopted the Belgian proposal to prohibit the use of poison gas under reciprocal conditions and to prohibit absolutely bacteriological warfare. The Poison Gas Protocol, signed at Geneva on June 17, 1925, is now before the nations for ratification. When these instruments of war devised by the chemist have been outlawed by an outraged public opinion it will be seen that chemistry, through an indirect process, has considerably hastened the day of peace! Scientists stand with the educators, the humanitarians, and the statesmen as advocates of peace. With an irresistible urge they have brought nations and peoples together, achieving in that process the physical unification of man-

kind. And more than that. They have stressed the moral implications flowing out from these widened intellectual horizons. It may truly be said that these pioneers of the new science are beating out a new world upon the anvil of time.

For Those Who Think

Can science be nationalized?

Have not the modern discoveries of science made inevitable the political unification of the world?

What contributions can be made by the biologist, the philosopher, and the psychologist to the sheathing of the sword?

Is modern chemistry on the side of peace?

What action has been taken to prohibit the military use of poison gases?

CHAPTER VII

YOUTH AND PEACE

MILLIONS of youth are traveling over these highways to international understanding. There is a reason for this. The great majority of the ten million known dead of the World War were young people in their teens. That, in brief, has been the supertragedy of every war. Young people want to live. They want to give form and substance to their dreams. They want to build homes and see children blossom into maturity. They are all the more anxious to live because they know that death upon the battlefield, as wars are fought to-day, accomplishes nothing. Nor do these young people want to live because they are afraid to die. Youth is not cowardly. There are an audacity and an eagerness about youth that never flinch in the presence of danger. What young people object to is the forfeiture of life for no apparent reason. The physical torture they suffer beggars description. They wade in the blood of their adversaries, and of their comrades too. They kill and are killed. When the shooting is over and the dead are buried and the night has come, a broken humanity convenes a conference in the desperate hope that order may be brought out of chaos. The young people who survive the conflict wonder why these same diplomats and politicians couldn't have composed their differences in the beginning, thereby saving the lives of millions of men, women, and children. Young people have come to the conclusion that they have been used for cannon fodder about long enough. They are sick and tired of the sordid business of rifle bearing and bayonet plunging. Because they are cowards? Not for a minute. The more forward looking of our young people have repudiated the military philosophy of life because they see stretching out before them a better way, a way of peace and of understanding.

Nothing said here about the youth of to-day is intended to give further currency to the all too prevalent gossip

about the alleged existence of an organized "revolt" of youth. There are so-called spokesmen for youth who give their hearers the impression that in every country there will be found a well-organized and highly disciplined army of revolutionary young people waiting only for their hour of destiny to slay the present adult generation and occupy for themselves the seats of the mighty. Every time reference is made in a public address to the "revolt" of youth some dear sister in the audience gets panicky, and in great consternation calls for the police to run the "bolsheviks" out of town. There need be no fear. There is no such "revolt" of youth, nor is there likely to be. It is true that many organizations of youth sprang into existence immediately after the war. Not a few of these youthful societies still abound while many others have passed out of the picture.

It should be said too that scores of thousands of youth aren't thinking about the problem of war at all. They have neither the intelligence nor the moral enthusiasm to respond to the high call of humanity for a warless world. A certain proportion of these young people are Epicureans —they live to eat, to drink, and to be merry. Others have been made ethically spineless by indulgent parents of jazz predilections. Still others are cynical. They are members of the "damned-soul" societies that have taken root on a few of our college campuses. In Europe, especially, one will find vast numbers of youth who have despaired of religion, and, with their backs turned upon the church, they preach their doleful gospel of despair. It must be admitted also that many young people surrender to their inherited prejudices without a struggle. They do this, perhaps, because they are so much like their parents. After making liberal allowances for the moral inertia of the type of youth just described it still remains true that the mind set of the leadership of the younger generation is cast in the mold of peace and fraternalism. History is always made by a minority, and generally by a minority of youth. We are interested here in that body of youth, small in number perhaps, but prophetic in purpose and outlook, around whom the future will gravitate. We will take a look at some of these young people.

"That brotherhood may prevail." These words are inscribed over the main entrance of the International House, New York City. More than five hundred young people live in this "lighthouse of international understanding." These young people represent more than sixty-five nations. One fourth of them are American, one fourth European, a third are Oriental, while the remainder represent miscellaneous nationalities around the world. Living here on the basis of cultural equality, these young people are evidencing the urge toward world unity, so characteristic of these youthful crusaders. Again, at a recent student conference in Milwaukee the five thousand delegates present gazed every day upon a cardboard miniature of the Eastern and Western Hemispheres, bearing the Latin inscription, *"Ut omnes unum sint"*—"That all may be one." Such is the racial and political philosophy of those who would build for the future. It may be said without fear of contradiction that the young people of to-day are internationally minded, happily free of the encumbrance of race prejudice, and devoted to the peace ideal. We shall first examine the activities of youth in this respect, in America, passing later to the youth of other countries.

The Christian World Education Committee of the Council of Christian Associations carries its message of world friendship to thousands of undergraduates on the campuses of America. This Committee has adopted for itself and for its student constituency the following statement of purpose: the cultivation of friendship with foreign students, especially with those now resident in America; the study of international issues, such as the World Court, the League of Nations, the Outlawry of War, and America's relations with Latin America and with China—in order to promote justice and good will; the appreciation of the worth of other peoples through their achievements in the fine arts, in philosophy and in social and political organizations; the establishment of better race relations in our own land; and the linking up of American students through their gifts with many worth-while projects in various parts of the world. Institutes on international relations are being held in many colleges under the auspices of this committee, and political opinions are being formed

that will have a marked effect upon the future political development of the United States and, by implication, of the world at large. Student referendums are conducted on questions of foreign policy. That in itself is something new under the sun. The student of to-day is keenly alert to the history that is being made all around him. He insists on making his voice heard on the concrete issues of the day. When the United States marines were sent into Nicaragua the students of America spoke their mind—a mind not at all in harmony with the policies of the administration. In 1928 a student delegation made up of representatives of twenty-one Eastern colleges, including Harvard, Yale, Amherst, Boston, Barnard, and Pennsylvania, journeyed to Washington and examined at first hand the situation then existing between the United States and Nicaragua. Resolutions were framed expressing the hope that Congress might investigate the legality of sending marines into the Central American Republic by executive order. Not long ago a World Court Conference met at Princeton University, attended by a carefully selected group of students from all over the United States, and that Conference went on record in favor of American adhesion to the Permanent Court of International Justice.

When the recent crisis was on in China and the Nationalists were seeking to establish a strong central government against great odds, a large section of America's student population sent the following message of good will to the youth of that country: "The members of the Summer Conferences of the Student Christian Movement send to the students of China our very cordial greetings. We are deeply interested in your heroic program for your country and the progress which your country has made and is making increasingly to the world life. We want our country to learn more from you and be more helpful to you in working out your program. We deeply regret the obstacles which our country has put in the way of your progress, and pledge what influence we may have to leading our country to be a real friend to China and to work side by side with you in producing in the world a richer life for all men." At every student gathering of recent years—and there have been many—undergraduates by the thousands have ex-

pressed their opinions on questions of peace and war. Their frank facing of this issue not infrequently called down upon their heads the caustic criticism of a hostile press and a misinformed pulpit. But they forged ahead—these youthful dreamers of the to-morrows. Never before have so many students grappled with those political issues upon which the destinies of nations rest. Before Mr. Hoover and Mr. MacDonald started their now historic disarmament conversations an Anglo-American Conference on youth was being held in London in which the conviction was expressed that the signing of the Peace Pact of Paris should be followed at once by a substantial reduction of the navies of Great Britain and of America.

Quite a unique project in world education was the Parley on War recently held on the campus of Wesleyan University. This parley, initiated and carried on under student leadership, attracted nation-wide attention. Military and naval experts were present to expound their theories of preparedness. Pacifists were there to refute these theories. Congressmen and professors were on hand to add their slant on world affairs. Textbooks on ancient histories were laid aside as these students counseled with their elders on such questions as the freedom of the seas, arbitration, conciliation, disarmament, and the renunciation of war. Many Model Assemblies of the League of Nations have been held within recent years at Amherst, Vassar, Chicago, Cornell, and Michigan Universities. Twenty colleges, including Bowdoin, Brown, Dartmouth, Harvard, Holy Cross, Mount Holyoke, Radcliffe, Wesleyan, and Yale, participated in the Amherst Assembly. For weeks prior to the convening of this Student Assembly of the League the students of these various colleges were making an intensive study of the various questions that had been placed upon the agenda. The flags of the nations were much in evidence when the Assembly finally got under way. Among the student delegations were many nationals of other countries. These foreign students mounted the rostrum and addressed their colleagues in their native tongue, after which their deliverances were translated into English. Resolutions on disarmament, security, and arbitration were debated pro and con, after which a resolution was adopted

providing for "complete and unconditional disarmament, except for police duty, to be forthwith carried out by the states, members of the League, in collaboration with the other nations of the world." Still another resolution was adopted in which the opinion was expressed that tariff schedules be reduced to those necessary for administrative purposes in order "to facilitate the economic unity of the world and to insure the political harmony of the nations."

Who said that American students are provincial-minded? Here is evidence to the contrary. These young people, as they face the future, are making a searching diagnosis of the causes of war. They are studying the paths to peace. They are seeking to understand the racial background of other peoples. In their Cosmopolitan Clubs they adventure along the lines of interracial fellowship. Through their own Friendly Relations Committee they are brought into personal contact with the ten thousand foreign students in American universities. A Crusade with Christ Movement is now in progress among the noncollege youth of America, participated in by the young people of the International Society of Christian Endeavor, the Epworth League, the Baptist Young People's Union, and like organizations of Christian youth. World problems are discussed at institutes and other gatherings of church youth with a clarity of understanding that is indeed remarkable. If space permitted, extensive reference might be made to other good-will projects sponsored by American youth in the interest of world friendship. Let it suffice to say that these young people have already become a ponderable factor in the balances of human destiny.

Turning now to the youth of other lands, we see a group of young people meeting in Peking under the auspices of the World's Student Christian Federation. "We believe," said these young men and women from around the world, "in the fundamental equality of all races and nations of mankind, and consider it as part of our Christian vocation to express this reality in all our relationships. We consider it our absolute duty to do all in our power to fight the causes leading to war, and war itself as a means of settling international disputes." The World's Student Christian Federation is, in reality, a student experiment in Christ's

gospel of international fellowship. Affiliated movements of the Federation exist in Austria, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Great Britain and Ireland, Hungary, India, Burma and Ceylon, Italy, Japan, Korea, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, the Philippine Islands, Russia, South Africa, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United States. The tens of thousands of young people identified with the Federation seek to "influence students to devote themselves to the extension of the kingdom of God in their own nation and throughout the world," and "to bring students of all countries into mutual understanding and sympathy, to lead them to realize that the principles of Jesus Christ should rule in international relationships, and to endeavor by so doing to draw the nations together." Long before the League of Nations came into being these student pioneers of world unity had brought into existence a world-wide fellowship of youth for the attainment of peace. By so doing they set the pace of history. They dared to believe, and they had the courage to act upon their belief, that it was possible to bring nations and races into a lasting reconciliation with one another. All this was being done when politicians in the chancelleries of state were laying their plans for world conquest at the point of the sword. It is worth remembering too that during the war not a single national movement withdrew from the Federation.

These young people are social reconstructionists. The story of the International Student Service reads like a fairy tale, but it is true, every word of it. When the war ended, thousands of students climbed out of the trenches tired and with nowhere to go. They had no funds. The outlook was dark and they were discouraged. What did these young people do? They determined to help one another, irrespective of the lines drawn by the war. The European Student Relief was organized. The principles underlying this service were absolute impartiality with discrimination toward none irrespective of creed, race, nationality, or political affiliation; promotion of student self-help and co-operation; and, finally, stimulation and maintenance of student initiative and responsibility.

The young manhood and young womanhood of forty nations participated in this relief movement. More than

two million dollars was raised, the gifts in most instances coming from students who were themselves pressed with poverty. The sagging faith of Europe's undergraduates was restored and processes of reconciliation were set into motion, the influences of which are still with us. The European Student Relief has since been reorganized and its name changed to the International Student Service. Since 1922 world conferences of youth have been held each year at the call of this international organization of young people. Such conferences have been held in Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Germany, France, Jugoslavia, and Switzerland, and they are attended on the average by the youth representatives of some thirty nationalities.

The I. S. S., as the International Student Service is known among undergraduates, has collected sufficient funds to establish a number of loan scholarships. Last year I. S. S. scholarships were given to twenty-six Russian undergraduates studying in France. It is now planned to place several African students in European universities. The German Student Co-operative Association, an outgrowth of the I. S. S., has established co-operative kitchens where more than 27,000 students secure their meals. In addition, this Association has established and supervises student shoe-and-tailor shops; student canteen and co-operative shops; student laundries; a student loan and scholarship fund; an employment bureau, and eighteen student hotels. A self-help school has been set up in Dresden and an International Institute for Self-Help has now been created for the collection and classification of data materials bearing on the economic status of students generally and of the co-operative measures initiated in their behalf. Confronted after the war with a situation entirely bereft of hope, these young people persevered until they saw the light breaking over the horizon. The I. S. S. with its passion for Samaritan service, and its crossing and recrossing of national boundaries and of racial lines, has been a tremendous influence in effecting the continental solidarity of Europe's youth. Premier Briand, in an address before the 1929 session of the Assembly in Geneva, called upon his comrades on the Continent to work toward a United States of Europe. Now, as

for many years, the undergraduates of those nations have lived together as though there were a United States of Europe. The diplomats are giving political recognition to a factor of the European situation clearly perceived by the student population ten years ago.

Again we see the broadening of youth's perspective in the enlargement of the program for student exchanges. Few scholarships for foreign study were available before the war. The Institute of International Education is now administering a large number of student exchanges between the United States and European countries. Such exchanges have been established between the United States and Czechoslovakia, France, Germany, Hungary, and Switzerland. In France there is an American Field Service Fellowship established "to provide an enduring memorial to the one hundred twenty-seven Field Service men who gave their lives to the cause and to perpetuate among future generations the mutual understanding and fraternity of spirit which marked their relations during the war." Many nations and educational associations have created foundations of one kind or another to provide for the exchange of their own nationals with the students of other lands. At least one thousand American students are studying in European universities. Five thousand students from the ends of the earth pursue their studies every year at the University of Geneva. All told, some sixty thousand undergraduates have left their homes to study in the academic institutions of foreign countries. What a stimulant to international comradeship!

Moreover, thousands of students on tours and pilgrimages are trekking their way across boundary lines with a remarkable frequency. There have been a number of student tours to Mexico within recent years. A delegation of undergraduates from several South African universities arrived in New York recently for a four weeks' study of American institutions, under the direction of the National Student Federation. These young people, traveling "tourist" on our ocean-going vessels, are planting the seeds of international fraternalism far and wide. These student migrations have assumed such large proportions that the Confederation Internationale des Etudiants, with head-

quarters in Geneva, has issued an International Student Identity Card, which entitles the holder to the social and fraternal privileges of the campus visited. And speaking of the Confederation Internationale des Etudiants, it is interesting to note that this organization is made up of the student unions of twenty-six European countries, including the National Student Federation of America. A house is maintained in Geneva known as the Students' International Union, and in this place the thousands of undergraduates in Geneva practice their gospel of world friendship. The writer has spent many a happy hour in this student center discussing world problems with the young people of various nationalities. Twenty-five thousand students frequent the Union headquarters each year, and these many contacts are laying the basis for interracial understanding in the years ahead.

Perhaps the most dramatic evidencing of youth's concern in the peace question was in the convening, in 1928, of the World Youth Peace Congress, in Holland. There, in the midst of the heaths and pinewoods of that peace-loving country, five hundred young people met "to unmask civilized savagery." All who were present—and the writer was among them—realized that something significant was taking place. Never before had there been anything quite like it. The white, black, brown, and yellow races were represented. Students, young business men and women, and manual laborers were among the delegates. Despite their differences in creed and color they were motivated with but a single thought—the averting of another war through the co-operation of the youth of the world. For ten days these youthful conferees discussed the bearing of politics, economics, education, religion, race, and minorities on the peace of mankind. Serious disagreements emerged as the debates got under way. The Conference divided on the question of the methods to be employed in establishing peace. A minority vociferously advocated world revolution, and a program of violence. They declared that nothing short of the catastrophic destruction of the existing order would suffice as a preparation for the coming of peace. The more moderate opinions of the majority prevailed, however, and the Congress went on record

as believing that world peace was to be achieved not so much through treaties and the renunciation of war as through the removal of all forms of social, racial, and industrial inequality. In the removal of these injustices the great majority of the youth attending the Congress called for the continued co-operation of the school and the church. The message sent to the Congress by Mahatma Gandhi, "Whether the world is to have Truth and Peace, or Untruth and War will depend upon Youth," was accepted by every delegation as a challenge to amalgamate the youth forces of every flag in the interest of a world solidarity based upon justice. A Continuation Secretariat was set up at the closing session of the Congress to provide for the uninterrupted activity of the young people of the world in the crusade for peace.

Youth, believing that age is largely responsible for the continued maintenance of the war system, is now striking out on its own. There is very little disposition among youth to do any more "goose-stepping." They visualize for themselves a nobler destiny. They claim it is their right to share in the formulation of public policies. They have done their share of the shooting. Now they want to have a part in the remaking of the world. They have earned that right and they mean to have it. In the exercising of that right these young people may be counted upon to play the rôle of the reformer, not that of the revolutionist.

For Those Who Think

Is there a "youth movement"?

What are the dominant attitudes of the more enlightened youth of the world with respect to peace and war?

Are American students provincial-minded?

Are these young people more or less concerned about world problems than were their fathers?

Describe the activities of such youth organizations as the Crusade with Christ Movement, the Friendly Relations Committee, the World Student Christian Federation, and the International Student Service.

In what way do these activities tend to break down racial and national barriers?

CHAPTER VIII

DISARMAMENT

THE visit of Prime Minister MacDonald to the United States in October, 1929, had the effect of stimulating public interest in the disarmament problem. The spectacle of a British Premier crossing the ocean to engage in conversations with an American President for the purpose of hastening an agreement for the scrapping of war vessels excited the imagination of the world. It is high time that efforts are being made to bring the mania of a competitive militarism to a speedy and decisive end.

It should be remembered that international disarmament is not a question of strategy. It is a question of honor. Are nations claiming to be civilized as good as their word? That question must be answered in deeds, not words. The world is pledged to disarm. No amount of smooth talk will alter that fact. The war was fought, in the language of President Wilson, to put an end to the costly race in competitive armaments. Millions of youth died with the hope that out of their graves there would emerge a clarion call to all peoples to disarm, once and forever. The Armistice was based on President Wilson's Fourteen Points, the fourth of which runs as follows: "Adequate guarantees given and taken that national armaments will be reduced to the lowest point consistent with domestic safety." On this platform the war came to an end.

At the Versailles Peace Conference the Germans were disarmed. Before affixing their signature to the treaty the German delegation stated that they were ". . . prepared to agree to the basic idea of the Army, Navy, and Air regulations, . . . provided that this is a beginning of a general reduction in armaments." This was agreed to. The Allied and Associated powers stated that they wished ". . . to make it clear that their requirements in regard to German armaments were not made solely with the object of rendering it impossible to resume her policy of

military aggression. They are also the first step toward the reduction and limitation of armaments which they seek to bring about as one of the most fruitful preventives of war, and which it will be one of the first duties of the League of Nations to promote." Noble words, these. Mankind breathed a long sigh of relief when this statement of purpose was made public. It seemed as though the nations were about to divest themselves of the heavy yoke of a competitive militarism. These hopes were raised still higher when the following words were woven into the text of the Versailles Treaty. "In order to render possible the initiation of a general limitation of armaments of all nations [Germany] undertakes strictly to observe the military, naval, and air clauses. . . ."

That was more than ten years ago. This solemn promise to disarm has not been kept. On the contrary, the nations have added to their military establishments. There has never been such a flagrant violation of the terms of any treaty as that of the refusal of the Associated and Allied powers to keep their word in this respect. The nations in question have made of their covenants "a scrap of paper." After the German fleet had been sent to the bottom of the ocean, and the German land forces had been reduced to the status of a police service, the victors proceeded to do the very opposite of the thing they had promised to do. Armies are still conscripted and navies have grown larger and larger. Submarines have been improved, and military aeronautics have been developed to an amazing degree. The chemists have devised deadlier gases than those used in the war, and disease germs have been added to the militarists' instruments of human destruction. A sorry picture, indeed.

Paralleling this unprecedented expansion of armies and navies have been the efforts of a more forward-looking group of statesmen to lay the basis for a World Disarmament Conference. The League of Nations since the day it came into being has studied the problem of armaments. It has rightly been felt that unless the League could effect the scaling down of military establishments its usefulness to the world would be seriously compromised. The members of the League, according to the language of Article 8 of

the Covenant, "recognize that the maintenance of peace requires the reduction of national armaments to the lowest point consistent with national safety and the enforcement by common action of international obligations."

The League, at its first session in 1920, created a Permanent Advisory Commission, and asked that body to make a preliminary technical examination of the steps to be taken in lightening the armament burdens of the nations. But little progress was made. Obstacles emerged on every hand. In 1921 the Council appointed a Temporary Mixed Commission made up of recognized authorities in the fields of politics, economics, and military strategy. During the next three years this commission made an heroic attempt to formulate a plan for the reduction of armaments. Efforts were made to fix a formula whereby land and naval forces might be measured and their comparative points of strength appraised. Little success attended these efforts, due, doubtless, to the obstructive tactics of the so-called military experts. Then, too, certain nations felt the need of a pre-established plan of security before armaments could be reduced.

In the meantime the United States navy kept growing larger and larger. The naval craft built by the Washington government in war days had added tremendously to the strength of its navy. Congress, in 1916, and again in 1919, authorized the construction of a large number of capital ships and auxiliary vessels. At about the same time Japan caught the ship-building fever. It looked for all the world as though Great Britain, the United States, and Japan were in for a naval race of unprecedented proportions. Sensational newspapers threw a scare into the American public by talking loosely about a "yellow menace." The big-navy men of England were afraid that the supremacy of the seas was about to slip through their fingers. Japan, in self-respect, felt the need of laying down additional cruisers and battleships. A sorry mess it was. Fortunately for the peace of the world, common sense intervened and a disarmament conference was called to meet in Washington in November, 1921. It was announced that the conference would discuss the two interrelated problems, naval disarmament and the problems of the

Pacific. The five chief naval powers—Great Britain, the United States, Japan, France, and Italy—the four additional powers with interests in the Far East—China, Belgium, Holland and Portugal—participated in the deliberations of this notable gathering.

It was demonstrated at Washington that reductions of armament can be made if the nations have the mind to make them. It was at this conference that the proud battleship met its fate. Secretary of State Hughes made his now famous speech in which he called for the scrapping of many of these "capital ships." This was done. Each of the five naval powers agreed to a definite allowance of battleships and airplane carriers. Great Britain and the United States were each given fifteen capital ships, totaling 525,000 tons. The capital ship tonnage of these two nations is slightly higher than this at the present moment and will remain so until the final reductions provided for by the Washington Conference have come into effect. Japan was given nine such ships, totaling 315,000 tons, and France and Italy five each, totaling 175,000 tons. This arrangement became known as the 5-5-3-1.75-1.75 ratio. It was further agreed that a "naval holiday" would be observed until 1931, during which time no additional capital ships were to be constructed. The span of life of this type of vessel was fixed at twenty years, and provisions were made for replacements within the total allowance. The maximum size of capital ships was fixed at 35,000 tons, it being also specified that these ships could not carry a gun of greater caliber than sixteen inches. No requirements were laid down regarding the number of airplane carriers allowed each nation, but total tonnages were limited. None of the powers have, as yet, exhausted their tonnages in this respect. England suggested that submarines be entirely abolished. France objected, and the suggestion was dropped. The American delegation had hoped that the 5-5-3 ratio might be applied to "auxiliary craft" such as cruisers and destroyers, but the conference adjourned without such an agreement being reached. After the conference was over, the United States scrapped nineteen vessels that had already been built, and eleven which were being built; England scrapped twenty-two vessels that

had already been built. England also gave up her alliance with Japan, and a new "Four Power Treaty" was signed and ratified by the United States, Great Britain, Japan, and France, in which many of the more perplexing problems of the Pacific were solved—at least for the time being. The one fatal blunder of the Washington Conference, as proved by subsequent events, was that no provision was made for the limitation or reduction of "auxiliary craft," more particularly cruisers. But that is another story.

The Temporary Mixed Commission, at Geneva, encouraged by the success of the Washington Conference, took up its task with renewed vigor. It approached the problem of disarmament by a backdoor method. The great majority of the members of the League had plainly stated that they would not disarm until they had received adequate guarantees of mutual assistance in the event of an attack by a hostile power. A Draft Treaty of Mutual Assistance was drawn up in which "the High Contracting Parties solemnly declare that aggressive war is an international crime and severally undertake that no one of them will be guilty of its commission." In the event of war between two or more of the signatory nations, it was planned to ask the Council to specify which of the parties was the victim of aggression, and whether or not the nation in question was entitled to the assistance provided under the treaty. A general plan of reduction of armaments was envisaged as one of the inevitable by-products of the coming into effect of the treaty in question. The Draft Treaty, while indorsed in part, was finally rejected. Disarmament hopes went glimmering and Geneva was steeped in pessimism.

The Assembly of 1924, attended by such outstanding peace advocates as Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, of Great Britain, and M. Herriot, of France, made still another attempt to solve the baffling disarmament riddle. The Geneva Protocol resulted from these efforts. The Protocol renounced war as an instrument of national policy. It recognized as compulsory the jurisdiction of the Permanent Court of International Justice. A complete system of compulsory arbitration was set up. A plan was perfected for the definition of the "aggressor." All contro-

versies were to be settled on the application of "sanctions" or "penalties"—mainly economic. Finally, the signatory nations were to agree that an international conference for the reduction of armaments would be convened in the following year. As later events proved, the slow-moving world was not yet ready to take such an advanced step. The Protocol came to grief, chiefly because of the refusal of Great Britain to adhere.

Not to be discouraged, the statesmen of Europe drew up the Locarno Agreements, applying, on a somewhat limited scale, certain of the provisions of the Draft Treaty of Mutual Assistance and the Geneva Protocol. We have already discussed the terms of this Treaty, but it should be added here that Great Britain and Italy agreed to provide Germany, Belgium, and France with supplementary guarantees within the framework of the Covenant. They agreed to maintain the territorial *status quo* between Germany and Belgium, and between Germany and France. Provisions were made for the demilitarization of the Rhine zone. Germany and Belgium, and Germany and France promised that they would in no case attack or invade each other. It was further agreed that all disputes between Germany and Belgium, or Germany and France, were to be settled by peaceful means. The Franco-Polish and Franco-Czechoslovak agreements provide that the parties shall lend each other immediate assistance in the event of either of them suffering from a failure to observe the Locarno commitments. The Locarno Agreements were subsequently ratified. Europe breathed easier. It appeared as though the time had at last arrived when disarmament, on a reduced scale at least, might be achieved. More delays, however, were encountered. It was felt by many nations that the groundwork of the proposed international disarmament conference had not yet been laid. Proposals and counter proposals were made. There was a great deal of talk with but little action. In the meantime Germany had been admitted to the League, and this was expected to hasten developments. It did, for a while. Then followed more delays and finally the Council, in 1925, set up the Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference.

As this Commission was settling down to its task, President Coolidge, alarmed at the continued competition in cruiser construction, issued invitations for another naval disarmament conference. Great Britain and Japan accepted the invitation. France and Italy declined. It was Mr. Coolidge's hope that the 5-5-3 ratio adopted at the Washington Conference for capital ships might now be applied to auxiliary vessels—cruisers, destroyers, and submarines. The conference met in Geneva in 1927. For six weeks the delegates argued back and forth and accomplished nothing. The divergent views of Great Britain and the United States with respect to cruiser tonnage and gun caliber could not be reconciled. The British delegation contended for a considerable number of small cruisers, under 7,500 tons, and a small number of large cruisers of 10,000 tons. The position of the United States was just the reverse of this. The American delegation contended for a comparatively larger number of 10,000 ton cruisers and for fewer small cruisers. Then again, the United States proposed that limitation be based on total cruiser tonnage. This proposition was unacceptable to Great Britain, it being felt that large and small cruisers should be limited, separately and distinctly. Furthermore, serious differences of opinion emerged as to gun caliber. After a few weeks of this sort of haggling the curtain dropped, the conference came to an end, and the conferees returned to their homes. The Geneva Three Power Conference failed because it lacked the will to succeed. The three delegations were made up largely of naval officers and military "experts." This preponderance of the military mind killed the conference, as it would kill any conference. There was also an unwillingness on the part of the delegates to face such questions as the freedom of the seas and the right of blockade. Nobody seemed to be willing to call a spade a spade. How could a parley on the limitation of armaments succeed under such conditions? Instead of creating a feeling of mutual good will between the chief naval powers the Geneva Conference had an effect quite the reverse of this. Statements were issued at London and at Washington, each government affirming that it had no intention of starting a naval race with the other. At the

best, however, a bad situation developed between these two English-speaking peoples, all because the shaping of public policies had fallen into the hands of the naval experts who either would not or could not look at the peace problem objectively.

Inasmuch as we are trying to present here, in chronological order, a brief analysis of the various attempts made since the war to consummate world-wide disarmament, we shall look once more in the direction of Geneva, where the activities of the Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference were slowly getting under way. The break-up of the Geneva Conference put a damper on the efforts of the League's Commission. It must be said, to the credit of the League, however, that that organization, in 1927, just one month after the termination of the Geneva fiasco, set itself to the task of examining afresh every aspect of the disarmament problem, and initiated practical measures designed to advance its objectives. Recommendations were made for the progressive extension of arbitration by means of special or collective agreements, including agreements between states members and non-members of the League, so as to extend to all countries the mutual confidence essential to the complete success of the Conference on the Limitation and Reduction of Armaments. A Committee on Arbitration and Security was created to facilitate the work of the Preparatory Commission.

With the arrangements completed the Preparatory Commission held its fourth session at the end of November, 1927. The United States, it will be recalled, had decided to collaborate in the work of this Commission, and an American delegation was present in Geneva in 1927 for this purpose. The delegate of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, who attended for the first time, read a statement on behalf of his government, proposing measures for the complete abolition of all land, marine, and air forces. The following steps were suggested for the realization of this proposal: the dissolution of all land, sea, and air forces; the destruction of all weapons, military supplies, means of chemical warfare, and all other forms of armament and means of destruction in the possession of

troops or military or general stores; the scrapping of all warships and military air vessels; the discontinuance of the calling up of citizens for military training either in armies or public bodies; legislation prohibiting the calling up of trained reserves; the destruction of fortresses and naval and air bases; the scrapping of military plants, factories, and war industry plants in general industrial works; the discontinuance of assigning funds for military purposes; and the abolition of military, naval, and air ministries, the dissolution of general staffs and all kinds of military administrations, departments and institutions. This proposal, as might have been expected, was shelved in short order, the prevailing feeling being that it would be time for Russia to talk of disarming when she had put her own house in order. Consideration was then given to the more technical aspects of the Commission's preparations for a world conference.

To bring the activities of this Commission down to the present it should be added that in May, 1929, despite the hopelessness of anything constructive being accomplished, the Commission met and was cheered by America's broad declaration to consider naval reduction on any reasonable basis. Ambassador Gibson, America's spokesman, followed this loudly applauded affirmation with an even more significant statement to the effect that the United States would withdraw its objections for including trained reserves in any estimate of land armaments. These two statements injected a degree of optimism into the Commission's outlook that had been lacking. France was particularly pleased with this newly defined American attitude, inasmuch as that nation had always opposed the inclusion of trained reserves in computing the strength of land armaments. The English delegation at the 1929 Assembly, however, urged the reopening of this controverted point, much to the disgust and the dismay of France. The British proposals were withdrawn, but not until warm words had passed between the spokesmen of the two countries.

To come back now to the distinctly American phase of the naval problem, it will be remembered that in the winter of 1927 the United States Navy Department proposed a bill

authorizing the construction of 71 war vessels at an estimated cost of $740,000,000. It was stated at that time, by the secretary of the navy, that the proposed bill was only the first step in a twenty-year program which would involve a total expenditure of $2,500,000,000. The people rose up in protest against the Big Navy Bill. Congress began hearing from the country. Business men, laborers, bankers, professors, teachers, and churchmen, one and all, urged the defeat of the proposed bill. There was nothing left for Congress to do but to respond to the will of the people. The House Naval Affairs Committee cut down the building program to 15 cruisers of 10,000 tons and one airplane carrier, to cost about $274,000,000. The time for starting construction was limited to three years and a clause was added authorizing the President to suspend all or part of the construction in case an international agreement were reached making suspension desirable. The Fifteen Cruiser Bill was jammed through Congress notwithstanding the earnest protests of tens of thousands of loyal citizens. President Coolidge had called the attention of the country to the pitiful failure of the Geneva Conference and to the alleged secret naval agreement that had just been negotiated between France and Great Britain. Thse two unfortunate circumstances were enough to convince Congress that the time had come to act. Even so, the authorization of these cruisers, particularly with a time-limit clause, was held by many to be a grave mistake, especially in view of the fact that the Senate had already ratified the Peace Pact of Paris. How, it was asked, could a nation renounce war with one hand and build cruisers with the other? That question has not yet been answered. Viewed objectively, it must be said that the prospects for disarmament were anything but bright.

At this critical moment two events took place which bid fair to change the course of world events for many years to come. Mr. Herbert Hoover was elected President of the United States, and a Labor Government was set up in Great Britain with Mr. Ramsay MacDonald as premier. These men came upon the scene not a moment too soon. In his inaugural address Mr. Hoover said: "The recent treaty for the renunciation of war as an instrument of na-

tional policy sets an advanced standard in our conception of the relations of nations. Its acceptance should pave the way to greater limitations of armaments, the offer of which we sincerely extend to the world." A month later Mr. Gibson, speaking for the President, before the Preparatory Disarmament Conference in Geneva, in April, 1929, said: "Great armaments are but the relic of another age, but they will remain a necessary relic until the present deadlock is broken and that can be accomplished only by the powers possessing the greatest armaments to initiate measures of reduction. . . . I am authorized to state that . . . we are willing to agree to any reduction, however drastic, of naval tonnage, which leaves no type of war vessel unrestricted. . . . My government has always felt that we need no exact balance of ships and guns which can be based only upon the idea of conflict—what is really wanted is a common-sense agreement based on the idea that we are going to be friends and settle our problems by peaceful means."

Both President Hoover and Premier MacDonald believe that the coming into effect of the Peace Pact places an inescapable moral obligation upon the nations to disarm. Believing this, and realizing, too, that the public would support them in their efforts, these two men initiated a transoceanic correspondence designed to bring to an end the threat of a naval race between the two countries. The dramatic swiftness with which these disarmament conversations were begun thrilled the people of all interested nations. The hope was expressed on both sides of the Atlantic that competition in cruiser construction might be stopped and the basis laid for a "naval holiday" in auxiliary ships of all kinds. The difficulties confronting these statesmen as they looked forward to a naval agreement were no less baffling than in 1927, when the Geneva Conference broke on the rocks of bitter dissension. But the will to overcome these difficulties was infinitely greater. Where there's a will there's a way, and in this particular instance a way was found. After three months of continuous conferences an announcement was made that the United States and Great Britain had reached an understanding with respect to cruiser construction sufficiently

conclusive to merit the convening of a disarmament conference, in London, in 1930. Invitations to participate in the projected conference were at once dispatched to the capital cities of France, Japan, and Italy. According to an announcement of these plans already agreed to, the United States would have a total cruiser tonnage of 305,000, and Great Britain, 339,000. Cruiser parity would be achieved by virtue of the fact that the United States would have a larger number of 10,000-ton cruisers than Great Britain; also, certain of the American cruisers would be mounted with guns of higher caliber than those of Great Britain. On the face of it this would not seem to be a reduction in cruiser tonnage, as far as the United States is concerned, inasmuch as American cruisers built, building, and authorized, now total 300,000 tons. The British, on the other hand, have cut down their claimed cruiser tonnage from 450,000 to 339,000. It is hoped that when the disarmament conference convenes these totals will be cut still further.

Moreover, the end of the giant battleship is foreseen. Serious consideration is to be given at the forthcoming conference to the question of abolishing battleships from the fleets of the world. It has been intimated that the "naval holiday" in capital ships, ordered at the Washington Conference in 1921 and scheduled to continue until 1931, will be extended to 1936. The United States now has eighteen capital ships of from 20,000 to 35,000 tons, and Great Britain has twenty. It is estimated that England spends $500 a minute on her fleet; the United States more, and that half of that amount is expended for the construction and maintenance of capital ships. One doesn't need to be clever in mathematics to figure out the tremendous savings to the taxpayers of the naval powers if the battleship is shelved, as it should be. To junk the battleships of the world, to say nothing of cruisers, destroyers, and aircraft, would place billions of dollars at the disposal of governments for tax reduction, the construction of highways and parks, and the development of public works.

Already we are beginning to see the benefits to the world of these new prospects for disarmament. The British government has begun withdrawing from active

service many of the cruisers that will have to be scrapped prior to the naval conference scheduled for 1936. Five British light cruisers have been ordered sold for whatever they will bring as junk. Fourteen other British cruisers will be retired within the new future. Work on the construction of two 10,000-ton cruisers, the Surrey and Northumberland, has been suspended. The American Navy Department, shortly after the tentative naval agreement with Great Britain had been made public, ordered the decommissioning of fifty-three destroyers of the battle and scouting fleets. These vessels will be sold for junk and will not be replaced. This policy is in line with the London and Washington governments' known desire to reduce the totals of destroyer tonnages. It is expected that under the provisions of the Hoover-MacDonald program ships of the destroyer type will be reduced by 200,000 tons. At the present time the United States has approximately 300,000 tons in this category and Great Britain around 240,000. It is now proposed to reduce this tonnage to 150,000 for the United States and 125,000 for Great Britain.

Turning from the international aspects of the disarmament problem we dwell for a moment on a situation peculiarly American. Speaking of the cost of war preparations, President Hoover, on July 23, 1929, said that current expenditure on strictly military activities of the army and navy constitute the largest military budget of any nation in the world to-day, and at a time when there is less real danger of extensive disturbance to peace than at any time in more than half a century. During 1927-28 the naval and military expenses of the United States were $624,600,000, of the United Kingdom $570,758,400, of France, $461,543,000. The figures for 1928-29 were $684,700,000 for the United States, $551,464,200 for the United Kingdom, and $407,910,000 for France. The estimated figures for 1929-30 are $741,000,000 for the United States, $547,284,600 for the United Kingdom, and $523,240,000 for France.[1] It came as something of a surprise to the great majority of the American people that its government was spending more money on war preparations than any

[1] New York Times, August 11, 1929.

other nation on the face of the earth. Coming from anyone other than the President such a statement would have been regarded as pacifistic nonsense. It must be kept in mind too that between 1923-29 inclusive the United States spent $4,900,000,000 on our army and navy, $3,000,000,000 for our Veterans' Bureau, and $6,000,000,000 in payments of interest on our war debt. Mr. Mellon, secretary of the treasury, is authority for the statement that in 1927 51.1 per cent of the taxpayer's dollar was spent on the public debt (a debt chiefly due to the war), 17.1 per cent was spent on the civil functions of government, and 31.8 per cent on the military.

When the United States, Great Britain, and other sea powers awake from their naval nightmare it will be possible to cut down the tremendous cost of war preparations in our own nation and in every nation. That this can and will be done seems quite probable in view of the success of the Hoover-MacDonald conversations. And why not? Why shouldn't the armies and the navies of all the nations be cut down? The theory that armaments prevent war has long since been exploded. It is now quite generally recognized that preparations for war, far from guaranteeing the peace of the world, are more than likely to provoke a state of war. Armaments, on the economic side, are a grievous burden to the taxpayer. Salvador de Madariaga, for six years an official in the Secretariat of the League of Nations, has estimated that the "defensive" budgets of all nations for 1927 were $3,856,000,000. He states, further, that the "defensive" budgets of all the nations members of the League of Nations for one year would finance the League of Nations, the World Court, and the International Labor Office for about six centuries![2] In other words, he says, the world is spending six hundred times more in preparing for war than in preparing for peace.

Sir Josiah Stamp, an economist of international reputation, stated that if the Great Powers would agree to disarm, it would mean "for the great mass of the people of these nations the difference between grinding penury and a reasonable standard of living." Millions of people the world over are being confronted with the grim specter of

[2] *Disarmament*, by Salvador de Madariaga. Coward-McCann, New York.

economic impoverishment. Why delay any longer the doing of a thing that would mean happiness and prosperity to the citizenry of every land? Are we still holding back because of an alleged lack of national security? What constitutes security? Practically every civilized nation is a member of the League of Nations, an organization specifically created to give all peoples and races a sense of security against attack. The Locarno Treaties have placed continental Europe upon a peaceful basis. A World Court has been established and many of the larger and more powerful nations, including Great Britain, France, and Germany, have signed the optional clause of that Court, thereby yielding to the affirmative jurisdiction of that international tribunal. And finally, we have the Kellogg Pact, adhered to by fifty-one nations, in which war is renounced and a solemn promise made that all disputes between nations will be settled only by peaceful means. More important than all else, the peoples of the earth want peace. What more is needed to provide the nations with that security which is a prerequisite for disarmament? Nothing more is needed, nothing. It is time, therefore, to quit talking about disarming and disarm.

For Those Who Think

Are the nations morally obliged to disarm? Have the promises to disarm made by the nations during and after the World War been kept?

What results were achieved at the Washington Conference on the Limitation of Armaments?

What is the 5-5-3-1.75-1.75 ratio as applied to capital ships?

What is the function of the Permanent Advisory Commission of the League of Nations? What is the League of Nations doing in this particular field?

Why did the Geneva Three Power Naval Conference fail?

What proposals have been made with respect to the cruiser tonnages of the United States and Great Britain?

What proportion of our national income is spent for military purposes? How can such expenses be cut down?

Will we ever arrive at a satisfactory solution of the disarmament riddle?

CHAPTER IX

CHRISTIANITY'S CONFLICT WITH MILITARISM

Christianity and militarism are irreconcilable. By Christianity is meant the religion of Jesus. By militarism is meant that spirit of reliance on force out of which wars emerge. We are not talking here about the use of force under law, such as the policing of our highways and our cities. We are not talking about the exercising of force under an internationalized neutral authority, such as the policing of the seas for peaceful purposes. Nor are we disposed to spend any time in discussing the merits and demerits of the wars of other centuries. We are concerned here with our own peculiar problem, the setting forth of the eternal irreconcilability of the teachings of Jesus with the policies and practices of war as we know and understand that institution to-day.

Militarism, like Christianity, is a way of life. Militarism believes in the ultimate triumph of force. Christianity believes in the ultimate triumph of love. Militarism believes in the power of the sword. Christianity believes in the power of the spirit. Militarism believes in a divisive nationalism. Christianity believes in a co-operative internationalism. Militarism believes in the inevitability of armed conflict. Christianity believes in the attainability of an enduring peace with justice. Militarism believes that killing is the crowning virtue of citizenship. Christianity believes just as strongly that service is the crowning virtue of citizenship. Militarism believes in the finality of an outer authority. Christianity believes in the finality of an inner conscience. Militarism believes in setting nation against nation. Christianity believes in bringing the East and the West, the North and the South together in one great human brotherhood. Militarism believes that men, like animals, are human and nothing more. Christianity believes that men, like Christ, are both human and divine.

Militarism believes only in the rights of one's own. Christianity believes in the rights of others. Militarism believes in a world of carnage and ugliness. Christianity believes in a world of beauty and brotherhood. Militarism believes in and worships Mammon. Christianity believes in and worships God. Militarism believes in the glory of death. Christianity believes in the glory of life. Militarism believes in might. Christianity believes in right. Militarism believes in the drab monotony of things as they are. Christianity believes in the shining glory of that which is to be. Militarism moves forward into the gray night of endless conflict. Christianity moves forward into the purple dawn of endless peace. Militarism bows its knees before the altars of the god of war. Christianity bows its knees before the altars of the God of peace. Between these two, militarism and Christianity, a chasm yawns deep and wide, and all the sophistries of time and eternity cannot bridge the gulf that separates the spirit of war from the spirit of the Risen Lord.

And the fruits of militarism, what are they? They are bitter fruits. Here they are: lust, revenge, hatred, atrocity, murder, falsehood, deceit, violence, anarchy, chaos, revolution, disease, pestilence, famine, jealousy, lawlessness, crime, sexual immorality, the bruising of conscience, the lowering of moral standards, servitude, blockades, bombs, disease germs, and death. And the fruits of Christianity, what are they? Here they are: peace, justice, brotherhood, sacrifice, love, forgiveness, patience, long-suffering, rejoicing, beauty, holiness, purity, friendship, faith, freedom, and life. These fruits, the fruits of militarism and Christianity, grow upon different trees. The one is rooted in despair, the other in hope. Can Christianity be brought into partnership with militarism? No, not in ten thousand times ten thousand years. It would be far easier to sweep back the tides of the ocean with a broom than to bring the spirit of Jesus into collusion with the spirit of militarism.

It is when we examine the by-products of modern war that its hideous outlines become immediately apparent to the mind and the heart of the believer in Jesus Christ. Take, for example, the toll of human life exacted by war.

Napoleon once said, "I was brought up on the battlefield and the loss of a million men means little to me." The brazen reality of that pagan philosophy dawns upon us as we traverse over the hillsides of the world, hillsides covered with the graves of the world's war dead. Ten million known dead soldiers, and 3,000,000 presumed dead soldiers in the Armageddon of 1914-18. It has been estimated that it would take ten days, from sunup to sundown, for the British dead, marching twenty abreast, to pass a given point; eleven days for the French war dead; thirty-five days for the Russian war dead—two months and a half of sunlight hours for the Allied dead to march in review before the reddened eyes of their bereaved loved ones. Six weeks more would be required to complete the march of the enemy dead—13,000,000 in all! In addition 13,000,000 civilians died as a direct result of the war, death in these instances resulting from war diseases, pestilences, famine, air raids, submarine attacks, exposure, deportations, malnutrition, and massacre. There was a time when in war only combatants were killed. The war makers of to-day are less considerate of human life. In addition to the 13,000,000 soldier dead, the World War crushed out the life of an equal number of civilian men, women, and children.

Nor is that all: 20,000,000 combatants and civilians were wounded; 3,000,000 were taken prisoners. An appalling number of children were orphaned by the war. Nearly 900,000 French children lost their fathers on the battle-front, as did more than 500,000 Italian children. Taking the orphan rate of France as a norm for the other combatant nations and the number of orphans mounts to 6,500,000. A conservative estimate places the number of war widows at 5,000,000. Perhaps the saddest stories of the war are those hidden within the memories of the 10,000,000 refugees, tens of thousands of whom, as in the case of the Armenians, walked out into a desert of despair and death. Here is an institution that grinds out the lives of millions of men, that orphans hundreds of thousands of God's children, that widows hundreds of thousands of wives and mothers, that maims and wounds the bodies of countless thousands of men in and out of the trenches,

that destroys the homes of the people of every land, that prostitutes virtue, that propagates vice of every description, that turns the gardens of the earth into graveyards. And we, as Christians, are asked not only to tolerate this institution, but to place our benediction upon it. May God forbid!

It is a truism that the havoc and human misery caused by the last war will be as nothing compared with the suffering and death that would follow in the event of another war. The chemists and scientists of every race and nation are covering the shelves of military laboratories with instruments of destruction. Poison gases of a hundred different varieties are being perfected. Unlike the gas used in the World War, one of these gases is heavier than air. It follows a man down into his trench or dugout. Nor is it necessary to breathe this gas to produce death. When the poisoned ether comes into contact with human flesh the result is fatal. A noted authority has said that where this gas falls upon a hillside no crops can grow there for seven years. Some experts of strategy are of the opinion that the use of disease germs in warfare is a much more effective method of military technique. Consequently, plans are going forward to disease whole communities of innocent noncombatants. Should war come again, sucking babies at their mothers' breasts would be required to breathe into their little bodies disease germs that would kill not only the mothers, but the babies as well. Bombs, capable when exploded of generating a heat of a thousand degrees, are being perfected. These bombs are to be dropped upon sleeping cities from airplanes guided by radio. The dropping of only a few of these bombs on the average city would result in a veritable hell on earth. Dante's Inferno would be a Paradise when contrasted with the torturing effect upon human life of poison gas, disease germs, and death bombs. Human intelligence is too frail to grasp the full extent of the pagan iniquities that would be visited upon the human race if the summons to war should come again.

Again the church is asked at least to remain silent in the presence of this unspeakable vileness. When the prophets of the pulpit call down the wrath of God upon

these pagan preparations for war they are called "unpatriotic." Some of them are called "Red," others "yellow," still others are "blacklisted," and denied their constitutional right of free speech. The question which the Church of Jesus Christ must face up to is this: Will it or will it not withhold its sanction from a war system capable of such heathenish monstrosities? There can be but one answer if the church is to endure as a witness to the world of that redeeming love as preached and practiced by the peacemaker of Nazareth. Not long age H. G. Wells, in an address before the German Reichstag, said, "Christianity claims to be a uniting religion to all mankind, overriding all races and kingdoms, but in practice it is closely associated with an antiquated cosmogony, a limited and partial teaching of history, and a supple acquiescence in existing institutions and in existing governments and dictatorships which is, no doubt, ascribable to its preoccupation with spiritual things." In that literary thrust at the church Mr. Wells vocalized the skepticism that lurks in the inquiring mind of men regarding the future of the church. What this English man of letters doubtless had in mind when he spoke of Christianity's "supple acquiescence in existing institutions" was the chronic habit of the church of preaching peace in times of peace and of worshiping at the Baal shrines of conflict in times of war. Mr. Wells' impatience with the religion commonly known as Christianity is shared by millions of people the world over. The war system and the spirit of militarism which it represents are everywhere recognized as being in utter conflict with the religion that seeks to perpetuate the memory and incorporate in the life of the world the teachings of the Risen Lord. What will Christianity say to this military monster that would batter down the gates of Paradise and take captive the sons of men?

That question might well be answered by studying anew the gospel as proclaimed by the Founder of the Christian faith. The writer is not disposed to make a detailed study of the words of Jesus as they bear upon this particular problem. That has been done many, many times. The words of Jesus with respect to peace and war are written so plainly across the heavens that he who runs

may read. It is impossible to put Christ in khaki. His were the garments of the servant, not of the soldier. War dwarfs the value of human life. Twenty-six million soldier and civilian dead as a result of the World War—what a wanton slaughter of human beings! In the cemeteries of France and Belgium the white crosses of the war dead stretch out mile upon mile. Beneath every cross there sleeps a son of God. Additional thousands of humans were blown into atoms and for them no graves were dug. They simply went out into the night and never returned, and for them no requiems were sung. Twenty-six million dead! Standing in the shadow of this desolation we hear the words of Jesus, "Are not five sparrows sold for two pence? and not one of them is forgotten in the sight of God. But the very hairs of your head are all numbered. Fear not: ye are of more value than many sparrows." And again, "Consider the ravens, that they sow not, neither reap; which have no store-chamber nor barn; and God feedeth them; of how much more value are ye than the birds." Human life is precious to the mind of Christ. It is cheap to the mind of the militarist. Can Christianity be made to lie down with an institution capable of such wholesale murder? To ask the question is to insult the memory of Him who said, "I came that they may have life, and may have it abundantly." Let the militarists rave all they have a mind to about Jesus resorting to physical violence in casting the money-changers out of the Temple. They will never be able to find any blood-stains on the hands of the lowly Nazarene. Jesus was not a killer. And war is a bloody business. It is not enough to talk about war in terms of parades and target practice. War is more than that—it is a grim game of slaughter. Can anyone deny that Christianity is in conflict with militarism? If it is, then the church as the body of Christ can never be used as an agency for the promotion of war. This would seem to be a self-evident truth.

War requires that we hate our enemies. Jesus not only forgave his enemies, but he loved them and commanded his disciples to do likewise. "Then came Peter and said to him, Lord, how oft shall my brother sin against me, and I forgive him? until seven times? Jesus saith unto

him, I say not unto thee, Until seven times; but, Until seventy times seven." War requires that we overcome evil with evil. Jesus preached and practiced a gospel the very reverse of this. "Ye have heard that it was said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth: but I say unto you, Resist not him that is evil; but whosoever smiteth thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. . . . Ye have heard that it was said, Thou shalt love thy neighbor, and hate thine enemy: but I say unto you, Love your enemies, and pray for them that persecute you; that ye may be sons of your Father who is in heaven." The Sermon on the Mount, from which these words are taken, extols such antiwar virtues as meekness, forgiveness, love, mercy, and peace-making. War can only be fought upon the principle of retaliation. This spirit was absolutely foreign to the mind of Christ. "All things therefore whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, even so do ye also unto them: for this is the law and the prophets." War exploits. Christianity is the religion of service. "Whosoever would become great among you shall be your minister; and whosoever would be first among you shall be your servant: even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many." With war come famine, thirst, nakedness, and disease. What a contrast to all this are these words from the Gospel of Matthew: "Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world: for I was hungry, and ye gave me to eat; I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink; I was a stranger, and ye took me in; naked, and ye clothed me; I was sick, and ye visited me; I was in prison, and ye came unto me. Then shall the righteous answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee hungry, and fed thee? or athirst, and gave thee drink? And when saw we thee a stranger, and took thee in? or naked, and clothed thee? And when saw we thee sick, or in prison, and came unto thee? And the King shall answer and say unto them, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of these my brethren, *even* these least, ye did it unto me."

War thrives on hatred. Jesus said, "This is my com-

mandment, that ye love one another, even as I have loved you. Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends," and again, "For whosoever would save his life shall lose it; and whosoever shall lose his life for my sake and the gospel's shall save it." The tree of war brings forth nothing but bitter fruit—tears, loneliness, deprivation, physical anguish, spiritual torture, disease and death. And Jesus said, "A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit. Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire. Therefore by their fruits ye shall know them."

War commands men to take the sword, whereas Jesus said to Peter, "Put up again thy sword into its place: for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword." Was Jesus right? Call the roll of the nations that sleep the sleep of the dead—Assyria, Babylonia, Egypt, Macedonia, Rome. They all perished by the sword that had been raised in their own defense. Moreover, the Carpenter of Nazareth lived in an age when militarism was being extolled to the skies. Rome was supreme, a supremacy won by the sword. The military philosophy of life was rampant. The Jews had been trampled under the iron heel of Roman domination. Judas Maccabeus had attempted to deliver the Jews from the bondage of their military task-masters. Jesus refused to follow Maccabeus in the way of war and armed revolt. There had grown up alongside of this master peacemaker a revolutionary party with a program calling for the forced overthrow of everything Roman. The Jews, at that very moment, were looking for a military Messiah who would restore to the sons of Abraham the prestige and glory of other days. They were ready, indeed anxious to proclaim Jesus as that Messiah. But He who bade Peter put up his sword was consistent enough to deny himself the use of the sword. The weapons of Jesus were love and persuasion. Someone has well said, "The anger we create will rend us, the love we give will return to us. Biologically everything breeds true to its type; moods and thoughts, as much as birds and beasts." Jesus was enough of a philosopher to know that hatred begets hatred, that love begets love, and that

cross of sacrifice is a more potent influence for good than a saber drawn from its scabbard.

Then, again, the spirit of militarism does violence to Jesus' ideal of human brotherhood. Said Jesus, "A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another; even as I have loved you, that ye also love one another. By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another." And again, "This is the great and first commandment. And a second like *unto it* is this, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." If these words do not imply the brotherhood of man, they are meaningless. But these words, taken together with the life of Him who uttered them, constitute mankind's most eloquent apology for human brotherhood. Universalism was also implicit in Jesus' thought about the Fatherhood of God. Listen to him as he exhorts his hearers: "That ye may be sons of your Father who is in heaven: for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sendeth rain on the just and the unjust." Jesus thought of God not as a tribal deity, but as the God of every man, woman and child who lives. By his own example he rebuked the doctrine of racial and national supremacy. His kingdom was to be a "great multitude, which no man could number, out of every nation and of all tribes and peoples and tongues." The gospel as preached by Jesus had a tendency to lift men above the inequalities of race and nationality. Paul too had caught the vision splendid. God hath "made of one every nation of men," he said, and has "determined *their* appointed seasons, and the bounds of their habitation; that they should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after him, and find him, though he is not far from each one of us." The early Christians in the practicing of their newly acquired faith lived as brothers. The Christian Jews renounced the ancient superstition that they were the "chosen people" of God, and mingled freely with their Gentile comrades of the Way. In the early Christian Church the Jew and the Gentile, the bond and the free, met on equal terms. The Greek and the Roman too entered into this fellowship of believers on the basis of spiritual equality. National ties faded into insignificance as the devotees of a resurrected Christ prayed and communed to-

gether. The bond of unity which men found in the spirit of Him who died upon the cross transcended all the lesser divisions of caste and color. Christianity, brotherhood, and internationalism are one and inseparable. While recognizing the legitimacy of national divisions (Jesus himself rendered unto Cæsar the things that were Cæsar's), Christianity transmutes all national loyalties into a consuming and passionate devotion to humanity. Christianity does not and cannot hold as sacred the doctrine of an unfettered sovereignty of the state or of a self-seeking nationalism. The Christian ethic stands as the eternal refutation of the theory of divisiveness, sectionalism, and parochialism. There is a oneness about the religion of Jesus that makes of the East and the West, the North and the South, a neighborhood.

Militarism, in principle and practice, scorns Christianity's ideal of human brotherhood. Militarism presupposes the existence of a sectional universe, with each nation spying on every other nation and each race jealous and suspicious of all other races. Militarism would die were it not for the fact that the professional war-makers instill in the hearts of each successive generation thoughts of ill will and distrust for all who live under any flag other than their own. Militarism nurses ambitions of nationalistic pride, ambitions that lust for satisfaction in terms of conquest, carnage, and bloodshed. Militarism, for its own ulterior purpose, digs chasms of misunderstanding between East and West, North and South. Militarism fans the fires of jealousy between Occidental and Oriental, between black and white, and white and yellow. It is when the spirit of militarism precipitates a condition of armed conflict that we see more clearly than ever before the irreconcilability between the cross and the sword. In war brother is set against brother. Under the stimulus of a fictitiously created war mania men are perfectly willing to kill one another in cold blood. And all the while God himself is being dismembered by the prayers of those who would have him drop bombs from heaven upon the "enemy," the "enemy" in such case being those against whom those who pray have pitted their forces. According to the Christian ethic every war is a civil war, for men

kill their brothers in Jesus Christ, and set at naught the prayers of the Son of God for the oneness of humanity. The Christian Church, as the body of Christ, cannot make peace with an institution that so brazenly sets itself in opposition to the high humanitarianism which is the very genius of the faith which it proclaims. By denying, in theory and practice, the principle of brotherhood, militarism brings itself into conflict with Christianity. Neither the teachings of Jesus nor his ideal of a world community can be made consistent with an institution that traffics in human life, that sets nation against nation, race against race.

The early Christians, at least, believed that militarism was in deadly conflict with Christianity. For more than three hundred years the bearing of arms was thought to be irreconcilable with the profession of Christianity. The followers of Jesus were thrown to the lions, hundreds of them, not because they had set fire to Rome as Nero alleged, but because they refused to "goose-step" in the armies of Cæsar. Those early worshipers of the Lord felt that they simply could not kill, and they didn't kill. They had caught a glimpse of the kingdom of God on earth, where justice and love and peace were to prevail and they refused to prostrate that faith by becoming paid killers in the army of the emperor. Professor Harnack is authority for the statement that up to 150 A. D. "the possibility of the Christian as a soldier did not exist," adding that "The early Christian Church was the first peace society." Justin Martyr held the spirit of war and the spirit of Jesus to be absolutely irreconcilable. Both Tertullian and Origen, among the most notable and more influential of the "Church fathers," held that a Christian could not serve in the army. Cyprian described war as wholesale murder. "Homicide is a crime when individuals commit it," he said, "it is called a virtue when it is called on publicly." The Council of Nicæa[1] took occasion to refer to "those who, being called by grace, have first shown their zeal and faith by abandoning the military profession, but afterwards have returned to it like dogs to their vomit. Let them be

[1] Referred to by Sherwood Eddy, *The Abolition of War*. Doubleday, Doran and Company, Inc., publishers.

'hearers' for three years, and 'penitent' for ten years." The wisdom and propriety of the early Christians in thus refusing to become a part of the Roman military machine may be questioned by the more "practical minded" citizen of to-day, but there the record stands, a record of bold defiance to the strongest military power that had ever wielded the sword. It is no exaggeration to say that we would not to-day have a Christian Church in which to worship had it not been for the fact that our Christian forebears dared to defy the military power of Rome. The testimony of these first-century Christians, a testimony sealed in thousands of cases by the death of those espousing it, cannot but add weight to the conviction that Christianity is in conflict with militarism and that the former, under no circumstances, is in a position to surrender to the latter.

Were it not for the mistaken zeal of Constantine the church's stand for peace might have remained unbroken through the ages. Constantine, who is reputed to have seen a fiery cross in the heavens, over which were written the words, *"In hoc signo vinces,"* must be held largely responsible for bringing the Christian Church into a position of ignoble compromise with the state with regard to war. The era of the Christian soldier dates back to him. The compromise between Christianity and militarism has continued from that day down to the present hour. Except for the "Truce of God" movement of the Middle Ages, the church has been used as an instrument of war. If the Christians of all lands had done as Christ commanded Peter, put up their swords, humanity would have been saved centuries of conflict. But because the church faltered the cross was used as an emblem of war and in the process the Christ of peace was chained to the chariots of military conflict. Only here and there were voices to be heard protesting against the sacrilegious surrender of the Christian ethic to the demands of military expediency. Down through the centuries of conflict men like Francis of Assisi, Wyclif, Peter Waldo, George Fox, William Penn, Morris, Rolland, Whittier, Garrison, and Tolstoy summoned the church to return to the banners of their professed Lord as the apostle of peace. The Quaker and the Mennonite church stood

alone for years in their uncompromising opposition to war.

The time has happily come when the church, as an institution, shows signs of taking more seriously the gospel of Jesus with regard to peace and war. Christians of every communion have now come to believe that it is impossible to reconcile Christ and war. The sword, as representative of the spirit of brute force, and the cross, as representative of the spirit of redemptive love, are now seen to be poles apart as far as their influence on human destiny is concerned. Christians, individually and collectively, seem determined to excommunicate the whole war system. Before studying the manner in which the church is attempting to sheathe the sword it might be well to inquire into the right of the church to address itself to questions of social and political import.

For Those Who Think

Is Christianity in conflict with militarism? If so, why? If not, why not?

What were the teachings and the spirit of Jesus with regard to peace and war?

Is it possible to summarize briefly just what the teachings and underlying principles of Jesus were as they bear on the modern problem facing his disciples in regard to peace and war?

What has been the historic attitude of the church in regard to war? Before Constantine? Since?

CHAPTER X

THE CHURCH'S RIGHT TO SPEAK OUT

HAVING set forth the essential points of conflict between Christianity and militarism, it is in order to inquire into the right of the church to speak its mind on questions of social import. The prior question must be raised regarding the right of the church to address itself to the state in matters of politics and diplomacy. The right of the church to declare itself on matters of current political interest is being repeatedly challenged.

A short time ago a resolution was presented in one of our State Legislatures calling attention to the fact that certain church bodies are attempting an unwarranted interference in matters of civil government "by continually adding to its program the attempted management of affairs which are distinctly nonreligious, thus undermining the teachings of Christ and the constitutional policy of the United States for the separation of the church and state."[1] Those ministers are highly commended "who confine their activities to serving the spiritual welfare of the people." Condemnation is laid upon those churchmen who "insist on meddling in political affairs."

Will we ever escape from the manifest shortcoming of such reasoning? Many people are still entangled in the meshes of the repudiated doctrine of trichotomy, a system of philosophy that ingeniously divided a man into three segments; body (*soma*), soul (*psyche*) and spirit (*pneuma*). Each one of these elements was thought to war against the others. Under no circumstances was the province of one to be invaded by either of the other two. The advocates of this theory thought that Jesus was restricted in his activity and influence within the elements of soul and spirit. He was never thought of as transgressing into the antithetical element of body. That theology

[1] Resolutions offered by Assemblyman Louis A. Cuvillier, New York, during the 1927 session of the New York Assembly.

turned the gospel of Jesus into confusion. It took Jesus out of the world of material things. It kept him aloof from the commonplaces of everyday life and surrounded him with a sort of immaculate virtue that could only become available on holy days, and then only in the temple, never in the market place. So it happens that even to this day there are those who believe that social, industrial, and international problems belong to the realm of the physical and are outside of the jurisdiction of the "golden-rule" preacher and his church. That theology has been used on more than one occasion to forge fetters about the feet of Christians, making them weak and helpless when they should have been strong and courageous. We see our mistake now. We have abandoned the barbaric practice of dividing a man and a nation into parts. We now propose to put the whole of human life under the sovereign and beneficent influence of a righteous world order. The church can preach no less a gospel than that. To remain silent in the presence of evils that mar the life of the spirit is to practice a divided allegiance that is offensive both to God and to men.

We have, moreover, in the practice of Jesus, a glowing vindication of the social gospel in all of its practical and political aspects. The attitude of Jesus toward the Essenes of his own day throws a flood of light on the whole question of the place of Christian influence in the life of the world. The term "Essenes" means "the silent ones." In the presence of evil they offered no protest, but departed into the quiet of some distant wilderness. They practiced celibacy, regarding human passions as antithetical to virtuous living. They spent the day in studying the sacred law, in prayers, and in fasting—and nothing more. Scripture reading, prayers, and fasting will not save the world, as we have long since discovered. The world will not be saved without the gospel story, nor without prayer, but it cannot be saved, and will not be saved, by these alone. Action of the most vigorous sort is required if the wrong is to be placed upon the scaffold and right upon the throne. Jesus realized that. When looking for disciples upon whose shoulders he could place the heavy responsibilities of world redemption he did not choose a single one

from among the Essenes. He had little or no use for a piety that isolated itself from the world. Had Christ joined hands with the Essenes, Christianity would have seemed a myth and Christian living an impossibility. The Essenes are with us to-day. They are religious isolationists. They regard the activity of the church in matters of state an unwarranted intrusion. Let the church and the preachers stick to the gospel! Let them baptize the infants, comfort the aged, and bury the dead! But let them under no circumstances transgress into those realms of social conduct and governmental procedure where only public officials, diplomats, and statesmen have the right of way! If the church conformed to such an interpretation of its responsibility in the complex life of the twentieth century, it would not be long until its voice would be silenced and its doors grown over with weeds. No, the church cannot accept the easier way of compromise. It must speak as did Amos, Isaiah, Jeremiah and Jesus, in the presence of kings. The only apology that the church of our day has to make concerning its belated interest in the domestic and foreign policies of the government, is that it has so long delayed the doing of its very obvious duty.

The conscience of Christendom, in the spirit of self-defense, if for no loftier reason, has aroused itself to the need of expressing its mind on political questions, as those questions affect the lives of the great majority of our own and other peoples. This does not mean a reversal of our treasured policy of absolute independence of church and state. It only means that that independence is not to be construed as totally removing whatever influence the church may be able to exercise upon the state. There is no desire on the part of the church to infringe on the rights of the state, nor to usurp its authority. There is only a desire to demonstrate that patriotism and religion can be blended together for the mutual benefit of both.

We have only to inquire into the nature of the state to see the reasonableness of this position. The traditional Christian conception of the state is that its authority rests on divinely inspired principles. The Christian ideal of government involves the practical working out of the will of God in the lives of men. In that sense the purposes of

the church and the state are identical. In both the Old and the New Testaments we see the gradual emergence of the idea of service as the only validating principle for the existence of the state. Mankind has not lacked for frequent and able presentations of this point of view. Greek and Hebraic literatures abound with Utopian ideas of the perfect state. Latin orators have waxed eloquent in praising that commonwealth where fairness and brotherliness for all mankind have been exalted. The Anglo-Saxon mind has more than once given itself to bold and prophetic utterances regarding the divine ends to be served by the state. Justice, equality, and peace have been held to be the paramount concerns of a righteously motivated community.

The prostitution of these noble ends at the hands of selfish men had too often made the state the instrument of greed and oppression. The sixteenth-century revolt of Europe against papal assumptions and priestly ministrations has not been an unmixed blessing. Protestantism was born in the throes of that revolt, but its by-product, nationalism, has seriously menaced the spiritual benefits of the Reformation. The state on more than one occasion has proudly lifted its head above the skies and boastfully claimed the right of making amendments to the laws of God.

Even before the Reformation the worship of the state had become a cult with multitudes of people. It was so during the days of Persian and Greek ascendency. In the Roman period the worship of the emperor had been made mandatory upon all subject peoples by imperial decree. It was because the early Christians insisted upon worshiping God rather than the emperor that they were thrown to the lions. Kings and queens and empire builders have in every subsequent age regarded the state as the object of supreme affection.

Listen to Machiavelli as he rails against God and eulogizes the princes of the state. To him the office of king represented the principle of an unimpeachable authority. Moral laws and spiritual precepts were made for weaklings, but the state could not, according to this brilliant and resourceful Florentine, be held amenable to any such restricting influence. To his way of thinking

the state was free to butcher, plunder, and enslave, and no man could so much as lift a finger of protest. Machiavelli was intoxicated with dreams of power and conquest, in which a mechanically driven state rode in gleeful triumph over the dead bodies of men, women, and children.

Three centuries after Machiavelli's voice had been hushed by death, Bismarck emerged as the exponent of a state that could not be restrained by any appeal to conscience. This Prussian politician identified "a true Christian state with monarchical absolutism." The worship of power was his meat and drink. He stood athwart the pathway of liberty and freedom. Nothing pleased him more than to confound the Progressives who staunchly defended the rights of the individual. In 1863, after a Progressive majority had refused him the necessary money with which to run the government, Bismarck proceeded to collect taxes without authority and with the aid of the military. It was at this time that Germany first became enamored with that Prussianistic brand of militarism that was later to precipitate a world war of unspeakable agonies. Any expediency, however questionable from the moral and ethical point of view, was made use of by Bismarck to increase the prestige and add to the influence of the state. His numerous wars, particularly those with Austria and France, were all arranged with the cunning of a mind that could not be touched by the nobler sentiments of fraternity and righteousness. The only divine authority to which Bismarck bowed in deference was the divine right of kings. There was no room for the church in this man's world. The state, not the church, was the mistress of life and the arbiter of right and wrong. Heinrich von Treitschke added his voice during this period to the popular clamor of Hohenzollern supremacy. Beginning his career as a liberal, Treitschke apostatized his early faith and became one of the chief defenders of civil as against divine authority. Political chauvinism found in him first a disciple and then a master. Bismarck and Treitschke together pitted their strength and wisdom against the skies, and while they lived the church remained as clay in the hands of the plunderer and the plotter.

Louis Napoleon Bonaparte in France and Count Camillo

di Cavour in Italy were likewise responsible for the further development of the worship of the state. The former practiced a policy of colonial imperialism for the sake of markets. His ambitions took him to Algeria, to the central islands of the Pacific, and to China. And in all of his thoughts there was little if any place for the church. Count Cavour was the one redeeming personality in the rise of continental nationalism, but even with him there was an all too frequent resort to war simply to advance the ends of the state, without regard for the larger liberties of the peoples involved.

Mazzini and Hegel glowingly idealized the state and wrote volumes about its supremacy in the realms of morals and conscience. Little wonder, then, that Friedrich Nietzsche, the hater of all things Christian, should write, "Here you have the state, of shameful origin; for the greater part of men a well of suffering that is never dried, a flame that consumes them in its frequent crises, and yet when it calls, our souls become forgetful of themselves; at its bloody appeal the multitude is urged to courage and uplifted to heroism."[2] Thrilled with the marching of men to battle, he exclaimed, "I felt for the first time that the strongest and highest Will to Life does not find expression in a miserable struggle for existence, but in a Will to War, a Will to Power, a Will to Overpower."[3]

Such is the doctrine of the state when divorced from the disciplining influences of a prophetically inspired religion. In such a conception of the universe everything is rendered unto Cæsar. God is left entirely out of the picture. The church is tolerated only to the extent to which it is willing to provide a rostrum for the ranting of the exploiter and a pulpit for the preaching of national bigotries. The theory of the divine right of kings, and the corollary of a state that cannot be held answerable to divine precepts, have been responsible for many of the world's ills. This interpretation of the state as an organism beyond the reach of moral law has filled the hillsides of the world with graves. It has planted white crosses for the World's

[2] Halvey, *Life of Friedrich Nietzsche*, p. 224. Quoted by Durant, *The Story of Philosophy*, p. 411. Simon and Schuster, publishers. Reprinted by permission.
[3] Durant, *The Story of Philosophy*, p. 441. Simon and Schuster, publishers. Reprinted by permission.

War dead in the cemeteries of every nation. It has widowed millions of wives. It has orphaned tens of millions of children. It has blasted the bodies and damned the souls of countless thousands of human beings. It has bathed the green grass of the fields with crimson and mocked the prayers of the innocent. It has created empires of lust, of cruelty, and bloodshed. It has poisoned, raped, and killed. It has broken the Ten Commandments of Jehovah. It has blasphemed the gospel of Jesus. It has ridiculed the power of right and deified the power of might. It has spread a blanket of darkness, disease, and death over the habitations of the sons of men.

Can it be that the church has no right to call a halt to this sort of thing? Have we so completely forgotten our heritage as Christians that we cannot or dare not challenge the alleged right of the state to live its life independent of spiritual sanctions? Must the church forever stand by while Machiavelli and Nietzsche preach the doctrine of a state whose ends are shaped by the arbitraments of force? True, the state has long since renounced many of the attributes ascribed to it by the more rabid nationalists of the post-Reformation period. Comparatively speaking, the state is a much more moral entity than it was in the sixteenth or even in the nineteenth century. That this is true is an indication of the progress already made in the church's heroic attempt to bring the state under the sovereign purpose of God. Notwithstanding the convictions of a Treitschke or the conduct of a Bismarck, it yet remains true that the state is, and ever shall be, amenable to the laws of God. The state, no less than the individual, must hearken to the gospel of right as against the gospel of might. The church cannot be denied its privilege of periodically reproving the state when the circumstances in question seem to warrant such action. That may be set down as one of the axioms of a morally conceived universe.

We must remember, however, that the church in its attitude toward the state has not always been characterized by a becoming discretion. If the state has erred, so has the church. We do not want a church dominated by the state. Neither do we want a state that shall be nothing more than a puppet of the church. Political democracy

and social righteousness cry out against the priestly dictatorship of a Hildebrand. Long before Bismarck appeared upon the scene the church had had its day of golden opportunity and had gone down in defeat. If we will turn back the pages of history to the eleventh century, we will find there the story of a church that aspired to political dictatorship. It was Hildebrand's opinion that the Pope "alone held the keys of heaven and hell, and he alone was able to bind on earth and loose in heaven, to give and to take away, according to the merits of each man, empires, kingdoms, duchies, countships and the possessions of all men." Hildebrand claimed the right "to depose emperors." He acted upon that assumption. He held that all earthly sovereigns must look to him for their spiritual and temporal welfare. To him the papacy was a divinely appointed universal kingship. His struggle with Henry IV is history's classic example of the self-arrogated authority of the priesthood and the church. Henry, the representative of the state, was excommunicated at the Roman Synod of 1076 by Hildebrand, the representative of the church. Henry was forbidden to exercise the functions of temporal authority over Germany and Italy. All the subjects of the king in both of these countries were absolved from their oath of allegiance. It profited Henry and the state nothing to characterize the Pope as "a false monk." When the irate king called upon the Roman vicar to "come down, to be damned throughout all eternity," he was met with scorn and derision. Things went from bad to worse for the dispossessed sovereign. The most abject and humiliating surrender ever made by one man to another was made by Henry IV when he crossed the Alps in midwinter to present himself to the Pope in the rôle of a penitent sinner. For three successive days he stood before the castle gate of Countess Matilda of Tuscany waiting for an opportunity to walk barefooted into the presence of the one who wielded the scepter of the cross. Here was the state, in sackcloth and ashes, supplicating the church for the right to exist as a political entity. The church, with a sort of mailed-fist vengeance, had battered down the gates of the German Empire. The temporal was in bondage to the spiritual.

This condition was not much improved when, in the seventeenth century, Oliver Cromwell, under the banner of the Protestant faith, unsheathed the sword in his efforts to make the church the dictator of human destiny. With his army of "honest, sober Christians" he defeated Charles I and established his so-called Divine Commonwealth. Cromwell was so determined to set up his theocracy that he was perfectly willing to butcher thousands of his fellow men in the process. And that is exactly what he did. The head of King Charles I fell into the guillotine basket with a thud. Scores of royalists were slain in battle by the soldiers of Cromwell, who sang hymns as they hacked their way to victory. While the streets of Ireland ran with blood Cromwell is alleged to have declared, "I am persuaded that this is a righteous judgment of God upon these barbarous wretches. . . ."[4] What blasphemy! The brutal methods so freely used at a later period by Bismarck for the exaltation of the state were already being employed by Cromwell for the elevation of the church! And more than that could be said to the shame of the church in its struggle for temporal power. The Crusades, despite the honest heroism of the religious enthusiasts who engaged in them, were religious offensives backed by the power of the sword. These several pilgrimages to the Holy Land involved a vast wastage of men, women, and children, and in the end they accomplished little, if anything. They did make abundantly clear that the kingdoms of this world can never come into the possession of Christ and his church by the exercise of arbitrary force.

When we summon the church of to-day to address itself to the state it is not with the vaunted pride of a Hildebrand that we do this. Nor is it with the drawn sword of a Cromwell that we preach Christ to the lawmakers and the princes of the earth. Nor is it with any intention of engaging in a twentieth-century crusade of conquest that we turn our faces toward Jerusalem. If the church contemplated a return to the subterfuge, the high-handed pressure and massacre of former days, to make its point of

[4] Hayes, *A Political and Social History of Modern Europe*, vol. i, p. 227. The Macmillan Company, publishers. Reprinted by permission.

view effective, then there would be sufficient reason to block its efforts. But the church is contemplating none of these things. It does not aspire to a position of temporal dictatorship. It does insist, however, on the right to exercise an advisory and co-operative influence on the state in all matters of public welfare.

The church is preaching this social and international gospel not only as a matter of privilege, but as a matter of duty. It is now realized that had the church in Germany constructively opposed Prussianism, and had the churches in other countries worked more diligently for the attainment of social justice and international understanding, the World War, in all probability, would never have been fought. That Armageddon, with its bankruptcy of victors and vanquished, with its heartaches and sorrows among all people, with its vast unnumbered dead, stands out as an example of what can and does happen when the church absents itself from the life of the world. It is to prevent the recurrence of such an international tragedy that the church, under the mandatory influence of a divinely decreed duty, has made bold to enter the arena of public affairs and demand that statesmen, diplomats, and politicians give heed to Christian principles rather than to considerations of political utilitarianism.

Thus it becomes clear that the line of demarcation between the spiritual and the secular, the church and the state, is not as closely drawn as many had supposed. True, the church and state, in America, and in many other countries, are separate, as organizational entities. Each has certain peculiar and specific functions that cannot and should not be delegated to the other. But it is nothing short of spiritual suicide to suppose that the state, because of its separateness from the church, is at liberty to engage in a form of conduct, the effect of which is to negate and blaspheme the gospel of the church. If the church is to be deprived of the free and unhampered functioning of its conscience in matters of public policy, it might just as well be nationalized and established by legislative statute. Under such a process all considerations of morality and religion would be answerable to the dictates of political expediency. If the day ever comes when the church is

charged with treason because it works and prays for world justice and peace, and in the pursuit of that policy ventures to take exception to certain aspects of our national and international policies, then may God be merciful to us, both as a church and as a state.

No, the church has a right, among other things, to speak its mind with regard to world policies. And what is more, it is determined to exercise that right. We are not, and never have been, believers in the doctrine of "the divine right of kings." Neither do we believe in the divine right of presidents, nor of secretaries of state, nor of foreign secretaries, nor of senates, nor of houses of representatives, nor of parliaments, nor of houses of deputies. We are living in an era of democracy when citizens, individually and collectively, have the right as well as the duty to co-operate with public officials in the shaping of public policies. Democracy would languish and representative government would perish were it not for the intelligent, though sometimes critical, interest taken in matters of state by people of high moral character. The mere fact of suffrage carries with it the implication that citizens are expected to declare their convictions, not only on election day, but on other days as well. Any other interpretation of citizenship makes of the individual a mere puppet of the state, a dumb and driven vassal of an undisciplined dictatorship. Treason obtains when citizens detach themselves from the life of the state and mutely acquiesce in whatever form of political maladjustment may obtain at the moment. Meek submission to what one believes to be wrong is the very antithesis of patriotism. However, the "me und Gott" idea of the state still persists in the thinking of many people. It is made the norm of patriotism—our rulers can do no wrong. To this unlimited authority all must submit, as do the creatures of dust to the lash of the taskmaster. It was this conception of citizenship and of patriotism that brought on the "Dark Ages," and that is to-day responsible for much of the darkness that casts its ominous shadow over the length and breadth of the land.

If the nations of the earth are to endure, this conception of citizenship must speedily be uprooted. That is what the church is trying so hard to do. It is preaching

in this solemn hour a higher and nobler form of patriotism —a patriotism that is corrective of the evils and mistakes of public policy, not submissive to them.

It is not surprising, therefore, if the church at times seems to be in the position of preaching to the government of which it is a part. The church cannot withhold its criticism of any public policy that jeopardizes the well-being of God's children or that threatens their peace and happiness, or that exploits the functions of government for the few as against the many. Harnack tells us that the early Christians had the habit of "petitioning emperors and governors and addressing written appeals to society, demanding the abolition of gross and flagrant abuses and outrages."[5] So it is to-day. The church stands upon its right to preach before the Cæsars and the Agrippas, proclaiming to them and to the magistrates and rulers of the earth the gospel of individual and of social righteousness. We are concerned here with the application of that principle to the peace policies of the governments of the earth.

A final word at this point. It has been affirmed that if and when the church expresses itself on political matters, it will inevitably be drawn into party politics. This would be a serious indictment of the church's purpose, if true. The church cannot be politically partisan in its relation to society for the simple reason that such action would be contrary to the spirit and the example of the founder of the Christian faith. Jesus was not a party man. He had no bond of affiliation with the conservative Sadducees. He remained aloof from the Pharisees, the political conformers. He scorned the Siccarri, the party of Jewish fanaticism. He refused to relate himself either with the Herodians, represented by some of the early church fathers as a Jewish sect in favor of the Roman Empire, or with the Hellenists, the Jews of Greek imprint. He refused to circumscribe his influence or link his destiny with the radical Zealots. If Christ were the fanatical revolutionist that he is sometimes declared to be, why didn't he allign himself with the first-century party of political revolution? The Zealots refused to pay tribute to the Roman king, and after their rebellion was suppressed they carried on a guerrilla warfare against

[5] Harnack and Herman, *The Social Gospel.*

the government under which they lived. Jesus was not a political revolutionist resorting to direct action to impose his own will upon an unconvinced or unwilling people. He is not that to-day, and those who so classify the Big Brother of us all do him an unspeakable injustice. The Man of whom we speak was not a party man. He was too big. He was too deep. He was too broad. He was too big in every way.

The church, in keeping with the principles of Jesus, will not, if it remains true to its heritage, espouse the cause of any particular political party. Neither will it become the agent for the advancement of party interests. The result of such a course, were it to be undertaken, would be calamitous. As long as we have the party system of government—and, on the whole, this seems to be as desirable as any other system yet devised—men who are thoroughly Christian in their private and public life will adhere to different political parties. The church would be dividing its constituency in an unlawfully violent manner were it to go into the business of championing the fortunes of one political party as against all others. Much of the criticism directed against the so-called political activities of the church is premised upon the mistaken conception that the church is doing that very thing. That is a mistake. It is not with any bias for or against any particular political party that the church ventures to examine the political precepts of the nations. The church's interest in public affairs must be expressed inferentially and by way of vigorous and articulate support for those policies that make for the ends of personality and the preservation of peace among ourselves and with all peoples.

The church, let it be reaffirmed, is a society of all those who believe in the sovereignty of Christ, in the Fatherhood of God, in the brotherhood of man. As such the church, in its institutional life, partakes of a universality that cannot be circumscribed by national boundaries. Its ethic cannot be blue-penciled by the political exigencies of the moment. If the Christian Church means anything, it means the exaltation of personality above every consideration of race or nationality. The church stands athwart the pathway of every selfish interest and denies to every

man and every nation the right to exploit human life for material gain. It is in the light of these eternal truths that the church makes bold to function in modern society as a promoter of world justice and as a maker of peace.

For Those Who Think

Has the church a right to speak its mind on social and political questions?

Do the teachings and attitude of Jesus throw any light upon this important question?

Can the state be made amenable to moral and spiritual precepts?

Has the development of nationalism been a help or a hindrance to the spread of the Christian gospel?

In what manner has the church abused its right to address itself to the state?

Is there a carefully drawn line between the sacred and the secular, the church and the state? If not, should such a line be drawn?

Has the church a right to concern itself with partisan politics?

CHAPTER XI

RELIGION AND PEACE

THE church is the body of Jesus Christ and as such its message and practice must conform to the message and practice of its founder. Jesus was a peacemaker. The church, if it would follow in his train, must be the evangel of peace. For centuries it was that. The Christian Church, in spite of persecution, stood out as a bulwark of protest against the vaunted militarism of the Cæsars. Then came the voice of compromise. The prophets of righteousness dropped out of the picture. Their place was taken by the priests of institutionalism and by the advocates of political prowess. The church and the state became one and the practices of the latter were condoned by the former. Lost in this wilderness of tinseled glory, the church became the mouthpiece of materialism. Christians donned the uniform of the soldier and the sword emerged as the symbol of power. The holy places of the temples of God were soon cluttered up with the banners of a gory militarism. The brotherhood of Christ was rent asunder as the devotees of the cross fought and killed one another upon the field of battle. Moral chaos followed as the pestilence of war spread over the earth. The God of peace was forgotten. The God of war was worshiped as the arbiter of human destinies.

This unholy wedlock between the church and the state continued from the days of Constantine down to and through the days of the Great War. On the very day that the war broke out a number of the leading churchmen of many lands were meeting in Constance, Germany, to organize a peace movement among the Christians of all lands. These emissaries of the cross had gone to Constance to pray for peace. They left with their prayers unanswered, for the scourge of war had already fallen upon the earth. For four long years the Christians of one nation leveled their guns of death at the Christians of other nations.

Christian pastors on both sides of the trenches implored the God of love to slaughter the "enemy." This Armageddon continued until twenty-six million combatants and civilians had been lowered in the grave. Again it had been demonstrated that the church had talked glibly of peace in times of peace, but practiced war in times of war. Little wonder then that millions of people lost faith in the church, preferring to walk in the fog of disbelief than in the darkness of hypocrisy. The writer attended the World Youth Peace Congress, in Eerde, Holland, in 1928. Scores of young people attending this peace gathering frankly stated that they were through with the church. They expressed their disgust with an ecclesiastical institution that could be so easily persuaded to do the bidding of the state. They referred particularly to the incident in Russia, during the dark days of the war, when the emissaries of the Czar came to the priests of the Orthodox Church on an errand of military strategy. It appeared that Russia was in sore need of metal for the molding of cannon. No metal was to be had. In desperation the state appealed to the church, suggesting that the bells be taken from the spires and towers of cathedrals and melted into implements of war. The representatives of the church readily agreed to this plan, feeling that it was their patriotic duty to support the state even at so great a price. The bells that had been cast for the solemn purpose of summoning worshipers to the altars of the church were now to be used as cannon on the battlefront. But the story did not end there. When, after the war was over, and a famine had spread itself over the land, the representatives of the Soviet government approached the dignitaries of the Russian Orthodox Church and suggested that the gold ikons be taken from the altar and sold and the money used to feed the poor and the hungry. The priests held up their hands in holy horror. To sell the ikons from the altar would be sacrilege, they said. The church, in other words, was perfectly willing to melt down its bells to make cannon, but it was not willing to sell its altar decorations to feed the hungry children of God. In a more or less conspicuous manner the churches of all lands during the days of the World War devoted their energies to cannon making. Caught in this mael-

strom of hatred and hostility, the church forsook Christ for Constantine.

A new church, however, has arisen out of the wreckage of the war. Realizing at last that military conflict cannot be humanized the church is apparently making up its mind to wash its hands of the whole war system. The conviction that war, if left unchallenged, would be the death of Christianity was born of necessity. Military leaders themselves saw that the church had come to the crossroads. Said the late Field Marshal Haig: "The Gospel of Christ is the world's only social hope and the sole promise of world peace. It is a crusade to which I urge you—a crusade not having for its object the redemption of a single city, however holy, but the freeing of the whole world from the devastating scourge of war." And General Tasker H. Bliss adds, "The responsibility for stopping war is entirely on the professing Christians of the world." An Episcopal bishop quotes another military man as saying: "The trouble with you church people is that you are not willing to back up your theories with your life, or even with your property. When one of we military men believes in war he is willing to go to war and be shot at. This you church people are not willing to do. Therein lies your great weakness. Whenever you are willing to pay the price of putting your principles into effect, then we military men will be obliged to retire. Our strength is due to your weakness."[1] In a similar vein Lloyd George once remarked: "The churches were to blame for the last war —not monarchs, rulers, militarists, but the churches. Had all the churches cried 'Halt!' this awful murder could not have gone on." Confronted with burning challenges of this kind, the church resolved to act. And act it did.

In 1921, three years after the war, a representative body of American churchmen formulated a creed of international ethics,[2] in which it was affirmed that nations no less than individuals are subject to God's immutable moral laws; that nations achieve true welfare, greatness, and honor only through just dealing and unselfish service; that

[1] The Rt. Rev. George A. Oldham, in an address at the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Washington, D. C., 1928.

[2] Adopted at Executive Committee of Federal Council of Churches, December, 1921.

nations that regard themselves as Christian have special international obligations; that the spirit of Christian brotherliness can remove every unjust barrier of trade, color, creed, and race; that Christian patriotism demands the practice of good will between nations; that international policies should secure equal justice for all races, and that nations should associate themselves permanently for world peace and good will.

One has only to study the action taken by the larger denominational bodies within recent years to become convinced that the church has broken away from its policy of aloofness and has definitely and heroically constituted itself one of the major factors in squaring the practices of men and of nations with the principles of Jesus. The Northern Baptist Convention, the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church, the National Council of Congregational Churches, the General Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church and the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, the General Assemblies of the Presbyterian Church in the United States and the United Presbyterian Church, the Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, the Evangelical Synod of North America, the American Friends' Service Committee, the Seventh Day Baptist General Conference, and the General Convention of the Universalist Church are among the many ecclesiastical and religious organizations that have lately addressed themselves to the problems of state, particularly with regard to the question of world peace and other issues of our international life.

Two nation-wide conferences on the Churches and World Peace have been held within recent years.[3] The Columbus Conference, convened in 1929, was representative of thirty-five communions and allied religious organizations. "We hold," said these Christian men and women, "that the churches of Jesus Christ should be a mighty dynamic in abolishing war. War denies the Fatherhood of God, scorns the brotherhood of man, mocks the sacredness of human life, is merciless to helpless women and children, uses falsehood, ignores justice, releases the passions, and cultivates hate. War means everything that Jesus did not mean,

[3] At Washington, D. C., in 1925, and at Columbus, Ohio, in 1929.

and means nothing that he did mean." What, then, should the Christian Church do with an institution that "means everything that Jesus did not mean, and means nothing that he did mean"? What could the church do but to place such an institution, and all the practices for which it stands, in the category of sin? This the Columbus Conference did. "We therefore hold," it was said, "that the churches should condemn resort to the war system as sin and should henceforth refuse, as institutions, to sanction it or to be used as agencies in its support." For the first time in centuries a representative body of Christians had dubbed resort to the war system as "sin."

Not satisfied with expressing pious generalities, the Columbus Conference delved into the economic causes of war. The following affirmation was adopted: "We hold that, since economic factors are primary causes of international suspicion and hostility and frequently lead to war, the churches should engage in the most serious study of such vital problems as foreign investments, war debts, raw materials, tariffs, armed intervention for the protection of property, and the whole question of the economic and political control of foreign peoples." It is the business of the church, in its pursuit of peace, to labor for the establishment of a universal brotherhood of all races and nations. Those forms of political and economic imperialism that work out for the enslavement of subject peoples are now falling under the condemnation of the Christian Church. The peons of Mexico, the outcasts of India, the so-called savage natives of the South Sea Islands, the dark skinned illiterates of the Philippines, the Negroes of Haiti, and the half-clad children of the tropics may be nothing more than grist for the mill of an economic imperialism, or, perchance, the innocent victims of a foreign policy of "manifest destiny," but to the Christian Church all men are brothers. As such they are entitled to the numerous individual and social benefits that accrue from that fact. They are not to be exploited for economic gain nor held in subjection for political ends. Their lives and their lands and their labor are not to be ravaged by the vast outreach of empire building. It is now seen that any political system that requires for its continued prestige and its

practical maintenance the enslavement and exploitation of unnumbered millions of half-intelligent natives is a system with which the Christian Church has nothing in common and against which the pulpits of Christendom must speak with compelling unction. The church must insist that the state shall do nothing to hinder the free life and the full development of any of the people over whom it exercises a political or economic sponsorship. The fact that some of these people speak a language different from our own, while still others are removed from us by seas and continents, or by color, does not in the slightest degree absolve us from our responsibilities, as Christians, in their behalf. The church cannot consistently preach brotherhood from its pulpits and then suffer without protest the compromising of that gospel at the hands of the state. It is well enough to preach in terms of general ethics and universal morals. The time comes, however, when the prophets of God must particularize. The virile ministry of Amos, Hosea, and Paul is an indication of the truth of this. The time has come for a re-emphasis of the gospel of the particular. This is said with direct reference to the peace and war policies of our own and other nations. There is something of greater value than mahogany in Nicaragua, or coffee in Haiti, or rubber in the Philippines, or sugar in Porto Rico, or oil in Mexico. That something is the spiritual welfare, the social, educational, and economic advancement, of the people in these several countries. The extent to which the foreign policies of the nations are influenced by a disproportionate emphasis on purely material considerations, to that extent is it bound to clash with the church's gospel of an international fellowship. Of special relevancy, therefore, is the recommendation of the Columbus gathering of churchmen: "Advocacy of the abandonment of the policy of armed intervention by one power on its own authority for the protection of the 'lives, property, and interests' of its citizens in foreign lands, and the substitution of nonviolent measures collectively administered."

In addition the following specific proposals were recommended to the churches in the United States by the Columbus Conference: condemnation of resort to the war system

as sin and refusal henceforth to be used as an agency or instrument in its support; loyal acceptance of the spirit and intent of the Paris Peace Pact; support of the government in international co-operation in the development as rapidly as practicable of the required agencies and procedures for the just and peaceful settlement of all controversies—Judicial Settlement, Arbitration, Conciliation, and Conference; support of our government in promoting the progressive codification and ratification of a system of international law based on the illegality of war; advocacy of membership by the United States in the Permanent Court of International Justice, and acceptance, with the other principal nations, of the optional clause for obligatory jurisdiction; advocacy of membership by the United States in the League of Nations, with such reservations if deemed necessary as may be mutually acceptable to the United States and to the members of the League; and finally, general and drastic reduction of armaments.

These proposals, in their entirety, have not as yet been acted upon by the religious bodies represented at the Columbus Study Conference. In the main, however, the prevailing church sentiment of the nation is in fundamental agreement with each one of these propositions. Moreover, the churches of Christ in America, within late years, have registered their moral convictions with respect to certain national policies having international implications. The churches gave remarkable support to the Washington Conference on Limitation of Armament in 1921-22. It was primarily due to the timely and effective protest of the church that the War Department abandoned its plans for an annual "Mobilization Day." Similarly, the churches have gone on record as being opposed to compulsory military education in civilian educational institutions. The churches of many denominations protested against the anti-Japanese discrimination in our immigration policy in 1924. The church at large is opposed to such racial discrimination and this opposition will continue until this particular wrong has been righted. When, in 1927, the War Department introduced a bill into Congress calling for the construction of seventy-one war vessels at an estimated cost of $740,000,000, the church people of the nation,

among others, flooded Congress with letters of protest, with the result that the proposed bill was abandoned, Congress finally passing a measure which authorized the construction of only sixteen vessels at a cost of $274,000,000. The church people of America believed and publicly stated their belief that the controversies obtaining between the United States and Mexico in 1926-27 could and should be settled by peaceful means—and they were so settled. In the spring of 1928, when it appeared as though the State Department would not respond to M. Briand's proposal inviting this country to enter into a renunciation of war treaty with France, the church people of every creed stepped into the breach and helped to create a public mind favorable to this epoch-making proposition. Resolutions have been forthcoming from the church at frequent intervals in support of numerous arbitration treaties and disarmament proposals. The churches are calling for a substantial reduction in armaments. President Hoover and Premier MacDonald have the hearty support of the churches of the United States in their efforts to put an end to the naval competition that has lately sprung up between Great Britain and America.

The Christian people of all communions are now rejoicing in the Peace Pact of Paris. They believe that the coming into effect of this treaty marks the beginning of a new era in the history of mankind. They believe that this Pact places the international relations of all peoples on a peaceful basis. They are determined that thoughtless politicians and selfish militarists shall not jeopardize the intent of this peace covenant. The Administrative Committee of the Federal Council of the Churches, in its Proclamation addressed "to Christians of all Lands and Lovers of World Justice, Goodwill, and Peace," voiced the sentiment of the church at large when it said: "A fundamental change in the character of international relationships has been initiated by the Pact and should promptly become the accepted basis of international relations. Suspicion, fear, and war preparations should no longer be dominating considerations in a nation's foreign policies. Every government accepting this Pact is in honor bound to search for and practice the principles of peace. Peace should become

the primary business of every country. Provocative measures should be scrupulously avoided, especially preparations for war beyond the need of actual self-defense. Justice, honesty, courtesy, and mutual consideration should henceforth be conspicuous elements of all national policies. These are imperative obligations, implicit in the spirit and purpose of the Pact. A nation which violates the Pact will stand before the world, not only as guilty of the most serious offense against the entire community of nations, but also as having violated its sacred word of honor. . . . All nations should promptly arrange for drastic reduction of armaments both on land and on sea. Such reductions would decrease the danger of war, beget mutual confidence and good will, and give convincing evidence of good faith in the signing of the Peace Pact. The churches of every land should cultivate among their membership the vision, courage, and faith essential to this program. . . . We rejoice in the Peace Pact of Paris. It ushers in, we hope and believe, the dawn of a new day. It opens the door to a new era in human history—an era free from the wrongs of war, an era glorious with the happiness and prosperity of a brotherly humanity. The destiny of future generations depends on what the present generation does with the Pact."[4]

Nor have the churches neglected the educational aspects of the peace problem. Among the recommendations contained in the Message of the First National Study Conference on the Churches and World Peace were the following: "The achievement of permanent world peace is dependent upon the development in children and youth, through education, of convictions concerning the Fatherhood of God, the spirit and teachings of Jesus Christ, the unity of the human family, and the principles of justice; and upon the establishment of attitudes of mutual respect and reliance upon reason rather than force. We therefore recommend that the Continuation Committee, in co-operation with the various educational agencies, denominational, interdenominational and undenominational, secure the preparation of an adequate program of education for the development of

[4] Adopted June, 1929, and subsequently sent to representative church leaders throughout the world.

these convictions and attitudes. We believe it is possible to train a contemporaneous generation of children around the world to find ways in which the gospel of good will can be applied to racial and international relationships. We therefore urge upon the communions the unique responsibility for world understanding presented through their missionary relationships. To this end we suggest that the committee seek the co-operation of the missionary and other agencies in the working out of such a system of training. Any effective program of education for peace must be thoroughly integrated with the whole process of education. We therefore urge that close working relations be established between all the program-making educational agencies upon which the churches depend, and that the plans for peace education be worked out co-operatively."[5]

Believing this, many church bodies in the United States have formulated a peace education program for children, young people, and adults. As many as thirty-six communions have organized World Peace Commissions or Committees, and one communion, the Methodist Episcopal, has set aside a working budget for its commission which has made possible the employment of an executive secretary who is responsible for the development of the peace education program of that particular church. The Friends Church, of course, has always provided executive leadership for its peace activities, and many other communions are now making plans to enlarge the executive scope of their peace education activities. A large number of young people's organizations, such as the International Society of Christian Endeavor, the Epworth League, and the Baptist Young People's Union, are co-operating in a Crusade with Christ Movement which has listed world peace as one of its three objectives. The Commission on International Justice and Goodwill of the Federal Council of Churches has maintained through the years a wide and varied program of peace education. So, too, have such organizations as the Y. M. C. A., Y. W. C. A., the Missionary Education Movement, the Church Peace Union, the Council of Women for Home Missions, and the Federation of Women's Boards of Foreign Missions. The Roman Catholic Church in the

[5] Held in Washington, D. C., December, 1925.

United States has just recently organized a Catholic Association for International Peace, "to study, disseminate, and apply the principles of natural law and Christian charity to international problems of the day, . . . and to further, in co-operation with similar Catholic organizations in other countries, in accordance with the teachings of the church, the object and purposes of world peace and happiness." The Central Conference of American Rabbis is likewise addressing itself to the problems of peace.

The church in other lands is awaking to its responsibilities in the promotion of international fraternity. Not only in America, but in England, in Germany, in Sweden, and in other European and Asiatic countries, the church has been speaking to governments and legislative assemblies in the interest of interracial and international concord. The World Alliance for International Friendship Through the Churches, with branches in more than forty nations, is making articulate the corporate conscience of Christendom with regard to international relations. At Stockholm, in 1925, the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work, which included the representatives of one hundred and three denominational bodies of thirty-one communions, with a total membership of more than three hundred and forty-five million Christians, concerned itself primarily with matters of public concern. This Conference represented the boldest effort ever made, in the name of world Christianity to save mankind from the curse of a competitive divisiveness. The churchmen of the Near and Far East, of England, of Europe, and of America met in Stockholm for the solemn business of making religion regnant in every phase of human activity. The Anglican and the Nonconformist sat side by side. The Established and Free Churches from the four ends of the earth prayed and worked together. A delegation of patriarchs and metropolitans traveled to Stockholm from the ancient cities of Bible lands. From the historic pulpit of Storkyrkan Cathedral the Bishop of Winchester called upon a church united in Life and Work to lift the curse of militarism from the tired backs of a war-weary people. It was at Stockholm where the churches of the world repented of their isolation from society. It was at Stockholm where

religion withdrew from its cloistered shelter and took up its vigil at the crossroads of human destiny.

Included in the message adopted by the Stockholm Conference were these significant words: "We summon the churches to share with us our sense of the horror of war, and of its futility as a means of settling international disputes, and to pray and work for the fulfillment of the promise that, under the scepter of the Prince of Peace, 'mercy and truth shall meet together, righteousness and peace shall kiss each other.'" These ecclesiastics from around the world then proceeded to call upon men and nations to pattern their social and international conduct after the example of Jesus Christ. The records and documents of the Stockholm Conference have been translated into the French, German, Swedish, and English languages. The seeds of that historic gathering have been thrown to the winds of God. They will be scattered far and wide. And the harvest! Who knows but that from this planting there shall some day blossom forth an era of perpetual peace.

Only a few years ago when the churches of America first gave expression to their holy resolve to wash their hands of war they were ridiculed by an unthinking public for starting something that they couldn't finish. But every hour confirms the belief that war is doomed and that the church is right. It is not only the church of America that has expunged war from its gospel and its creed. The churches of England, of Europe, and of Asia have caught up the refrain of a warless world and one after another they are letting it become known that they are in the world to obey God rather than men. Organized Christianity has come to the conclusion that it has played the minor rôle of following long enough. The mandate of the hour is for a spiritual leadership that will direct a misguided world to find its better self. The churches of the world are obeying that mandate. The Christian religion means to co-operate with education, diplomacy, business, and labor in the achievement of a harmonious and peace-loving universe. The followers of Jesus are out to strip organized warfare of every vestige of moral authority. This does not mean that ministers are to forsake their pulpits nor

the laymen their pews to engage in political activity as such. It doesn't mean that churchmen are to take the "stump" for political candidates, nor carry red, white, and blue umbrellas in political processions. It simply means that the church, in America and elsewhere, has engaged in a great moral crusade to abolish war as a means of settling international difficulties. This changed attitude of the church on the war question will ever be remembered as one of those miracles of social development capable of removing mountains of accumulated prejudice and misunderstanding. This discovery of a social Christianity that is responsible to God for the establishment of a warless world is giving birth to a spiritual renaissance, the total benefits of which are as yet but faintly realized by the world at large.

Furthermore, the various non-Christian religions of the world are enlisting in the peace movement. The question now being raised by the devotees of the world's faiths is "What can Religion contribute toward establishing Universal Peace?" In answer to that question the believing world is organizing its religious forces in the service of peace. There was a time when the devotees of these many religions were differently minded. In the Tower of London the tourist will find a number of swords alleged to have been used by the Crusaders in their bloody march toward Jerusalem. In those days Christians and Moslems thought only of killing one another for the glory of God. In pursuance of this policy the Christians of the crusade period fashioned swords with handles on both sides of the sharpened blade. This cross-shaped sword was used as an instrument of slaughter on week-days and as a symbol of worship on Sundays.

Down through history the bloodiest trails have been those traversed by that peculiar type of religious fanatic who believed that he had been mandated by high heaven to plunder and exterminate those who bowed their knees to gods other than his own. The religious hostility out of the loins of which there have sprung many of the deadliest wars of the past has continued in a more or less aggravated form down to the recent past. There seems to be something inherently germane to sectarianism that makes for

conflict, and when that sectarianism takes on the dimensions of a competing world-wide religion setting itself up in grim conflict with other faiths the consequences are too often fatal to mankind. The gospel of peace and brotherhood preached by these various religions has been rendered of no effect by the conflict and hostility obtaining between the followers of the world's opposing isms. Scores of people have been driven into attitudes of skepticism and negation by the apparent inability of religious enthusiasts to set their own houses in order. "How," it is asked, "can the swords of the world be sheathed as long as those who preach peace practice war?" Religion, instead of functioning as a unifying influence to bring mankind to a condition of comity and co-operation, has had the effect of dividing men and nations, initiating at intermittent intervals an Armageddon of bloodshed and moral disaster. The highbrowism and exclusiveness heretofore practiced by the princes and potentates of the church, mosque, and synagogue have hindered rather than helped the races of the earth in their vain struggle for a warless world.

As we have already seen, the postwar period evolved a totally new series of psychological influences, the most dominant of which lies in the direction of a unifying of the world's political, social, and economic relationships. Each of the international interests of the modern world, save only religion, has felt and responded to this high call of unity as against divisiveness. True, there have been notable instances of a welcome fraternalization between various sects within the confines of certain religions. Protestants, as at Stockholm, have bridged many chasms. Mohammedans, to a greater extent than ever before, have learned to love one another. Confucianists are coming closer and closer together, and the Hindus look longingly toward the healing of their family wounds. But nowhere, until very recently, has a courageous statesmanlike attempt been made to apply this unifying principle to the whole field of inter-religious relationships. Always there has lacked the one thing most necessary—a common purpose that would not impinge on the tenets and prerogatives of the religions in question. So much for the past.

We are now face to face with an entirely new situation.

RELIGION AND PEACE

The menace of twentieth-century militarism has driven the devotees of the world's living religions into the providential necessity of laboring together for the preservation of that spiritual reality which is at once the stimulus and crowning glory of every soul-satisfying faith. It has now come about that Christians, Mohammedans, Confucianists, Jews, and Gentiles, and all the rest stand ready to join hands and hearts in a co-operative onslaught against the god of war or each and all together will go down into the grave that knows no resurrection. It is folly to suppose that mankind will any longer pin its faith to any religious system that is helpless to stay the hand of the militarist who would scatter disease germs and poison gases over the face of the earth. Of unique significance, therefore, was the convening in Geneva in the summer of 1928 of the Preliminary Conference to make arrangements for a Universal Religious Peace Congress. In that city, in the Athenee, hard by the Reformation Wall, there took place a conference without parallel in the religious history of mankind. Christians, Jews, Mohammedans, Buddhists, Confucianists, Shintoists, Parsees, and Hindus prayed and conferred together for peace on earth and good will toward men. Eleven of the world's living religions were represented in that historic gathering. There had never been anything like it before. Out of these deliberations the conviction emerged that only through the united effort of all the religions of mankind could there be any hope of ringing out the old order of war and of ringing in the new order of peace. At the present time the leaders of these many faiths are making preparations to convene an inter-religious peace conference where the religions of the world are to be organized for the fulfillment of the ideal expressed in Isaiah's vision—"Nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

For Those Who Think

Has the Christian Church maintained its historic revolt against the war system of the nations?

What is the church of to-day saying on the peace question? Can these utterances be taken seriously?

Should or should not the churches stand for "condemnation of resort to the war-system as sin," and refuse henceforth "to be used as an agency or instrument in its support"?

In what way are the churches of other lands enlisting in the peace movement?

What efforts are now being made to organize the religious forces of the world, both Christian and non-Christian, in the interest of peace?

CHAPTER XII

ORGANIZING THE WORLD FOR PEACE

THE world must be organized for peace. Notwithstanding the fact that education, science, business, and religion are gradually removing the causes of international conflict it yet remains true that nations can live at peace with one another only upon the basis of organization. Science can go on achieving the physical solidarity of the universe, education the cultural, business the economic, and religion the spiritual, but until these efforts are supplemented with the creation of the machinery of peace there can be no permanent sheathing of the sword. Indeed, the very fashioning of this vast network of the new and enlarged interests of mankind has made imperative the development of those legal and political forms of organizations, competent to handle the affairs of a unified humanity.

Nor is this by any means a newly conceived ideal. From the beginning of time there has been a constant expansion of the sphere of law and judicial processes. The jurisdiction of government has steadily widened as mankind has progressed toward the goal of civilization. Appalled by the wastage of the successive wars that had swept over Europe, Grotius, in 1625, set himself to the task of bringing a larger measure of sanity into world relations. His *De Jure Belli ac Pacis* ("The Right of War and Peace") has since come to be recognized as the first book of international law. Grotius visioned the possibility of replacing war by law. He was among the first who maintained that disputes between nations could be settled by conference and by arbitration. William Penn had envisaged the setting up of a European Diet for the purpose of preventing the spilling of "so much human and Christian blood." He also believed that a closer political integration of the Continent would recover "in some degree" the fading reputation of Christianity, and would tend to stem the tide of misunderstanding and conflict. The moral

and spiritual exhaustion resulting from the wars of the seventeenth century led the Abbé de Saint Pierre to write his *Project for a Perpetual Peace* (1712-13). Here, again, the belief was expressed that a perpetual union among European monarchs would aid in the establishment of peace. Then came Rousseau with his startling and daring work, *A Lasting Peace,* in which the author advocated a permanent Diet or Congress, a guarantee of territories fixed "as at the moment of the treaty," and common action against recalcitrants. Then, in 1786, Jeremy Bentham gave to the world his conception of an International Tribunal, in which he looked forward to the reduction of armaments and the self-government of the then existing colonies of the larger powers. Bentham was a bold dreamer of world unity, and he, like certain of his predecessors, argued for the establishment of a Congress of Nations. Immanuel Kant's *Toward Perpetual Peace* was in the nature of a thrust at the balance of power theory of government. He believed that peace could and would be attained in the observance of the following principles of international conduct: no secret clause in any treaty; no absorption of any independent state by another state; no standing armies; no national debts for foreign affairs; no violent interference by any state with the constitution or government of any other state; states at war are not to use methods such as would make reciprocal confidence impossible; the democratization of the constitution of every state; the founding of the Law of Nations on a Federation of Free States.

Then came the time when the armies of conflict rode roughshod over the graves of these daring dreamers. But the ideal to which Grotius, Penn, Saint Pierre, Rousseau, and Kant had given themselves with such splendid abandon would not down. The eyes of mankind had been focused upon the outlines of a warless world. Then came the period of mediation and of arbitration. The truth had at last dawned upon men that nations could, with honor, settle their disputes without resort to war. Beginning with the middle of the nineteenth century and continuing down to the present time, nations have shown a commendable willingness to submit their disputes to the peace-

ful processes of arbitration. The negotiation of a number of arbitration and conciliation treaties during the latter half of the nineteenth century evidenced the desire of mankind to rise above the pagan level of armed conflict.

But the nations still lacked a plan of world organization. Of what use were arbitration treaties, it was argued, when there was no world court to pass upon the legal aspects of international controversies? Then the Czar of Russia issued his memorable call for a Peace Conference at The Hague. Twenty-six states responded to this invitation and the first Hague Conference met in 1899. The American delegation had gone to The Hague convinced that the world's outstanding need was for an international court competent to handle disputes judicial in character. The outcome of that Conference was the creation of a Permanent Court of Arbitration. In the strict legal sense the Hague Court is not a Court. It is a panel of jurists appointed by the several states affixing their signatures to the convention. It is entirely optional with the members whether or not a court is formed. If a dispute arises and the parties so desire, they may constitute the tribunal and initiate the processes of arbitration. The first Hague Conference, as subsequent events proved, marked an epoch in the history of mankind. Arbitration had now become a world issue, and the need of the machinery for peace had now become apparent. The second Hague Conference, in 1907, made a brave effort, though without much success, to develop the principle and extend the scope of these arbitral processes. The extent to which America had become committed to the principle of arbitration was made clear in the instructions given to the representatives of this nation. The American delegation was urged "to bring about in the second Conference a development of the Hague Tribunal into a permanent tribunal composed of judges who are judicial officers and nothing else, who are paid adequate salaries, who have no other occupation, and who will devote their entire time to the trial and decision of international causes by judicial methods and under a sense of judicial responsibility." It was found to be impossible to create such a tribunal due to the inability of the conferees to agree upon a satisfactory scheme for the

election of judges. No less than thirteen different methods for the selection of judges were recommended to the Conference. Each in turn was voted down. The delegates left for their homes with little if anything accomplished. The world remained in a state of disorganization.

Nations, by this time, had come to recognize the indisputable fact of their interdependence. They had evolved a somewhat nobler conception of national sovereignty. They had taken the initial steps not only in the creation of the international mind, but in the evolvement of a world structure of peace. Then the World War came. But the hopes of humanity for a warless world could not be crushed. It had now been demonstrated that arbitration and conciliation treaties and Hague tribunals, of themselves, were powerless to stay the hand of war. Mankind must be organized for peace. That was the outstanding lesson learned by the nations during the days of the great war. It was realized, on both sides of the trenches, that civilization was done for unless the nations organized themselves on a peaceful basis. Consequently, the Peace Conference, meeting at Versailles, passed a resolution declaring that "it is essential to the maintenance of the world settlement . . . that a League of Nations be created." It was also affirmed that "this League should be treated as an integral part of the general treaty of peace." One of the famous Fourteen Points President Wilson had stated was: "A general association of nations must be formed under specific covenants for the purpose of affording mutual guarantees of political independence and territorial integrity to great and small states alike." In keeping with President Wilson's pronouncement and with its own declared purpose, the Peace Conference appointed a special commission, representative of the fourteen allied states, with instructions to formulate a plan for the political federation of the nations for the preservation of peace. This commission met under the chairmanship of President Wilson, and, after weeks of intensive study, completed the text of the Covenant of the League of Nations. The Covenant was then accepted by the Peace Conference, at a plenary session, and made an organic part of the Treaty of Versailles. The League of Nations came into legal exist-

ence on January 10, 1920, with a membership of twenty-four states.

The purpose of the League is stated in the Preamble of the Covenant: "The High Contracting Parties, in order to promote international co-operation and to achieve international peace and security by the acceptance of obligations not to resort to war, by the prescription of open, just, and honorable relations between nations, by the firm establishment of the understandings of international law as the actual rule of conduct among governments, and by the maintenance of justice and a scrupulous respect for all treaty obligations in the dealings of organized peoples with one another, agree to this Covenant of the League of Nations."

Whether one believes in the League or not, the spectacle of the great majority of the nations of the earth engaging in a great co-operative undertaking for the purpose of bringing mankind at last to peace with itself, cannot but stir the imagination of every peace-loving person on earth. Born at a time when the world was torn by political and racial discord, the League has demonstrated its usefulness as an agency of peace. Berated by its critics and doubted even by many of its friends, the League has functioned in numerous ways through many years for the prevention of new wars and for a softening of the tension points around the world. The time has come when every lover of peace should, without political bias, objectively survey the accomplishments of the League, and on the basis of these accomplishments appraise the usefulness of this organization as an agency for the pacification of the world.

The fifty-four states, members of the League, give official recognition to the fact "that the maintenance of peace requires, first, the reduction of national armaments to the lowest point consistent with national safety, and second, the enforcement by common action of international obligations." Each state undertakes "to interchange full and frank information as to the scale of their armaments, their military, naval, and air programs, and the condition of such of their industries as are adaptable to warlike purposes." The states declare "that any threat of war" is "a matter of concern to the whole League" and that the

League "shall take any action that may be deemed wise and effectual to safeguard the peace of nations." They further declare it "to be the friendly right" of each ". . . to bring to the attention" of the bodies they set up "any circumstance whatever . . . which threatens to disturb international peace or the good understanding between nations upon which peace depends." The nations adhering to the Covenant agree to submit any threatening dispute "either to arbitration or judicial settlement or to inquiry by the Council." These nations further agree "in no case to resort to war until three months after the award of the arbitrators, or the judicial decision, or the report of the Council," and to carry out in good faith "any award or decision" and not "to resort to war against a member of the League which complies therewith." In addition, the states undertake, in the event a member of the League resorts to war in disregard of the obligations under the Covenant, "immediately to subject it to severance of all trade or financial relations" and to insure "the prevention of all financial, commercial, or personal intercourse" with it. To the Council is delegated the responsibility of recommending "to the several governments concerned what effective military, naval, or air force the members of the League shall severally contribute to the armed forces to be used to protect the covenants of the League."

The Assembly, in September, 1929, meeting for the first time since the ratification of the Pact of Paris, not only by the United States, but by practically all the members of the League of Nations, felt that it would be necessary to amend the text of the Covenant in keeping with the obligations assumed under the Pact. The Covenant, on the one hand, does not forbid resort to war if and when the League procedure has failed to produce a settlement. The Peace Pact of Paris commits the signatory nations to renounce war altogether as an instrument of national policy. The settlement of disputes, under the Pact, is never to be sought except by pacific means. The effect of the Pact is to "close the gap" of the Covenant, forbidding resort to war under any circumstances. The Assembly, therefore, has appointed a committee to study the question of making these two instruments of peace consistent with one another.

With respect to organization it is enough to say that the Assembly is made up of representatives of all members of the League, each delegation having one vote. Some idea of the importance attached to the League by the nations may be had by reflecting on the fact that the 1929 Assembly included among its members twenty-four foreign ministers and eight premiers. The 1928 Assembly was attended by all but nine of the European foreign ministers. The Assembly, which meets every year in September, is qualified to deal with any matter "within the sphere of action of the League or affecting the peace of the world." This body elects new members to the League, the temporary members of the Council, and the judges of the World Court. Its powers permit it to examine any dangerous international situation inimical to the peace of the world. As such the Assembly of the League has come to be considered as the chief agency for the focusing of world opinion upon issues and incidents germane to the maintenance of peace. Publicity is the Assembly's most powerful weapon. Its work is carried on through six main committees. The first committee deals with legal and constitutional questions, the second with the work of technical organizations, the third with disarmament, the fourth with budgets and questions of international administration, the fifth with social questions, and the sixth with political questions.

The Council originally had only four permanent members, but this number was increased to five with the admission of Germany into the League. The permanent members are Great Britain, France, Germany, Italy, and Japan. There are nine nonpermanent members, elected by the Assembly. The 1928-29 nonpermanent members were Canada, Chile, Cuba, Finland, Persia, Poland, Rumania, Spain, and Venezuela. The Council meets four times a year to review the then existing world situation. The responsibility for the supervision of the mandates system set up by the League has been intrusted to the Council. This body is also charged with the task of preparing plans for disarmament. Questions of procedure are determined by a majority vote while questions of policy require a unanimous vote.

The Permanent Secretariat, composed of some six hundred persons from as many as forty nations, gives continuity to the activities of the League. The members of the Secretariat are experts in their respective fields, and their co-operative endeavors are under the administrative direction of the secretary-general. The Secretariat is made up of the following main sections: political, financial and economic, transit, minorities and administrative, mandates, disarmament, health, social, intellectual co-operation and International Bureaus, legal and information. The Secretariat organizes the Council and Assembly meetings, prepares and publishes the various League documents, registers and publishes treaties, and serves as a fact-finding body.

Volumes would be required to interpret the activities and accomplishments of the League. Several political mediations have been effected by this organization. The Aaland Islands dispute was peacefully settled when the Council recognized Finland's claim for sovereignty, while at the same time it validated Sweden's claim for the preservation in the islands of the Swedish language. The Polish-Lithuanian boundary dispute had brought on a state of imminent war when the League intervened. Hostilities were averted, a temporary peace was proclaimed, and in this conciliatory mood, the nations concerned are now seeking a permanent solution of their difficulties. The dispute involving Upper Silesia was submitted to the Council, presided over in this instance by a Japanese, and an agreement was reached which provided for the administration of Upper Silesia as an economic whole for fifteen years. The quarrel between Jugo-Slavia and Albania over a question of frontiers was settled by the League even after Jugo-Slav troops had entered Albania. The Italo-Greek dispute was the most dramatic of all the international differences referred to the League. It had been reported that certain Greeks had murdered certain Italian officials. Italy made a series of demands on Greece, only a part of them being complied with, whereupon Italian naval authorities bombarded and took possession of the Island of Corfu. The world was excited, and with Greece appealing to the League all eyes turned toward Geneva. The League called for the

immediate cessation of hostilities. Italy was granted the indemnity originally claimed by her, Corfu was evacuated, peace prevailed, and Greece and Italy resumed normal relations. The League then effected the peaceful settlement of the Memel dispute and of the Iraq frontier question. In the fall of 1925 Greek troops moved into Bulgaria when it had been rumored that a Bulgarian battalion had attacked a Greek sentry post. On the same day that the Greek troops crossed the frontier Bulgaria telegraphed the secretary-general of the League, asking that the Council be summoned. This was done, one member arriving in Geneva by airplane. A telegram was dispatched to the two governments in question reminding them of their obligation not to resort to war. Within forty-eight hours the Bulgarian and Greek governments had ordered the withdrawal of their respective troops. An impartial investigating committee was dispatched to the scene of action. Greece was found to be responsible for the fighting and she was obliged to pay Bulgaria an indemnity of $224,000. This sum was paid and the frontier services of the two countries were subsequently reorganized. Due largely to the moral pressure exercised by the League and the Pan-American Conference the Bolivia-Paraguay dispute, in 1928, was settled without resort to arms. Wars in the past have very often arisen out of disputes between nations less serious in their implications than those already handled so successfully by the League of Nations. It is not too much to say that the League, during the past nine years, has prevented what might well have been a series of international conflagrations.

The League's activities in the field of the reduction of armaments are worthy of the highest praise, despite the fact that the Preparatory Committee for the Disarmament Conference has had no end of difficulty in getting its program under way. This committee, as already indicated, has made an exhaustive study of the military, naval, aerial, and economic aspects of the disarmament problem. To expedite the reduction of armaments the League negotiated two treaties, the Treaty of Mutual Guarantee, 1923, which provided for mutual defense against aggression, and the Geneva Protocol, 1924, which provided for mutual defense

against aggression by a state refusing arbitration. These treaties failed of ratification, but the Locarno treaties and the coming into effect of the Peace Pact of Paris will considerably facilitate the work of the League's Disarmament Committee. The World Disarmament Conference will be summoned just as soon as the draft convention for the reduction of armaments has been prepared. Progress cannot be anything but slow. Germany wants disarmament. France wants security. Great Britain wants small cruisers. The United States wants large cruisers. Russia wants general and immediate disarmament. And so it goes. It must be said to the credit of the League that that organization has persevered, despite these many difficulties, with the result that the hopes of the world for a general program of disarmament are brighter to-day than ever before. Mention has already been made of the humanitarian and economic phases of the League's activities.

The United States has co-operated, officially and otherwise, with many of the League's activities, including those for the suppression of the traffic in opium, obscene literature, women and children, and forced labor; disarmament; public health; financial reconstruction of impoverished nations; refugee settlement, and intellectual co-operation. The time has come for the American people to study, in a non-political manner, the question of the future relation of the United States to the League. This question has not as yet been finally disposed of.

The Permanent Court of International Justice, instituted in 1921, met still another of the world's needs with respect to the machinery for peace. The Hague Tribunal had failed of its larger purpose. With the termination of the war the question of a world court once more forged to the front. Article Fourteen of the Covenant of the League provided that the Council should formulate and submit to the members of the League plans for the establishment of a Permanent Court of International Justice. This was done and the World Court, as it is popularly called, came into existence in 1921 by the separate action of twenty-six sovereign nations. Mr. Elihu Root, former American secretary of state, collaborated with a committee of distinguished jurists in framing a plan for the new court.

The problem of electing judges had finally been solved. The Protocol of the Court provided for simultaneous voting by the Council and the Assembly on nominations through the Hague Court panel, and in this way both the "Big" and "Small" Powers participated in the election of the Court's judges. The Court is permanently constituted with eleven judges and four deputy-judges, elected for nine years, and is not, as the old Hague Court was, a mere panel of jurists. The World Court is a court of law, not of arbitration. It is not subject to political influences. Its decisions are based on the legal principles implicit in existing treaties, international practice and precedent, or accepted international teaching. The Protocol of the Court, now signed by fifty-two states of which fifty have ratified, was accompanied by an "optional clause" in which the adhering nations accept the principle of compulsory jurisdiction in legal disputes. Questions falling under this category include those concerning the interpretation of a treaty, any point of international law, the existence of any fact which if established would constitute a breach of international obligation, and the nature and extent of the reparation to be made for such a breach. Forty-two nations, including Germany, France, and Great Britain, have become parties to the "optional clause." Moreover, many of the postwar treaties make reference to the Court of certain possible disputes obligatory. All states, under a resolution adopted by the Council in 1922, have access to the Court on equal terms, irrespective of membership in the League of Nations. The sessions of the Court are held at least once a year, in the Peace Palace at The Hague. Extraordinary sessions have been held each year, save one. Decisions of the Court are by majority vote, and these decisions are sustained by the strength of public opinion, no provision having been made to enforce the Court's decrees.

On its record the World Court has demonstrated its high value as an agency of peace. In its seven years of history the Court has rendered sixteen judgments. Sixteen advisory opinions have also been handed down. These judgments and opinions constitute the basis for the development of a code of international law. The Court's prestige increases year by year. The questions submitted have dealt

with a wide variety of issues, and the solutions reached have been acceptable to the interested parties. The judgments and orders rendered by the Court involved the following specific questions:[1] the case of the S. S. Wimbledon on the freedom of the Kiel Canal; the Mavrommatis Palestine Concessions; the interpretation of a reparation clause in the Peace Treaty of Neuilly; the Mavrommatis Jerusalem concessions; German interests in Polish Upper Silesia; the case concerning the renunciation of a Treaty between China and Belgium; the case concerning the seizure of nitrate factories at Chorzow; the case of the French mail steamer Lotus. The advisory opinions handed down by the Court dealt with the following subjects: the nomination of delegates to the International Labor Conference; agricultural labor and the International Labor Organization; nature of a dispute about nationality decrees; protection of German settlers in Poland; the acquisition of Polish nationality by German settlers; the Javorzina boundary question between Poland and Czechoslovakia; the frontier between Albania and the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes at the Monastery of Saint-Naoum; the exchange of Greek and Turkish populations; the Polish postal service in the free city of Danzig; the nature of the Council's action with respect to the frontier between Turkey and Iraq; the jurisdiction of the European Commission of the Danube between Galatz and Braila.

After years of delay the Senate of the United States, on January 27, 1926, voted America's adherence to the World Court with five reservations, the fifth of which has been a real source of difficulty, unacceptable in all of its implications to the states members of the Court. This reservation referred to the advisory jurisdiction of the Court, and read as follows: "That the Court shall not render any advisory opinions except publicly after due notice to all states adhering to the Court and to all interested states and after public hearing or opportunity for hearing given to any state concerned; nor shall it, without the consent of the United States, entertain any request for an advisory opinion touching any dispute or question in which the United States

[1] For a detailed description see *The World Court*, by Manley O. Hudson, p. 11ff. World Peace Foundation.

has or claims an interest." The signatories to the Court treaty met in conference at Geneva in 1926, to pass upon these reservations. The fifth reservation proved to be the stumbling-block, inasmuch as it seemed to give to the United States the special right of vetoing advisory opinions. A further exchange of views was recommended, but the United States refused to discuss the matter. More than two years elapsed. Then, on November 24, 1928, President Coolidge announced that the Washington government was desirous of resuming conversations regarding American adherence to the Court. While in Europe in 1929 Mr. Elihu Root journeyed to Geneva and discussed there the question of American membership with a committee of distinguished jurists that had been appointed by the Council to revise the Constitution of the Court. A draft protocol was drawn up by this committee accepting the Senate's reservations in principle, and indicating by what procedure they should be put into operation. With regard to the fifth reservation the protocol provides that, whenever the Council is considering asking the Court for an advisory opinion, there is to be an exchange of views between the Council and the United States "as to whether an interest of the United States is affected." If an agreement between the United States and the Council cannot be reached, the United States may withdraw from the Court "without any imputation of unfriendliness. . . ."

This protocol was unanimously agreed to by the Conference of signatory states at Geneva, on September 4, 1929. A few days later the Assembly of the League placed its approval upon the terms of the protocol. Prior to the Assembly's action Mr. Stimson, secretary of state, made public a statement in which he said, ". . . I have satisfied myself that this draft protocol, if ratified by the other signatory powers, would meet the objections raised by the Senate and fully protect the United States against the dangers anticipated by the Senate. . . ." It is confidently believed that when the Court members have formally ratified the Root formula the Senate of the United States will vote American adherence to the Court.

The establishment and successful functioning of the League of Nations and the Permanent Court of Interna-

tional Justice gives form and substance to the faith of humanity that wars can and will be stopped.

A word should be added here with respect to the Bank for International Settlements, which is shortly to be established under the terms of the Young Plan for the financial liquidation of the war. The settlement of reparations involves the mediation of a bank between the first annuity payments and the last distribution of these payments among the creditors. The projected world bank will have no political connections. It will be managed by an international board of directors. The political influences of the reparations problem will then be superseded by financial management and control. Moreover, the purpose of the proposed bank is "to provide additional facilities for the international movement of funds and to afford a ready instrument for promoting international financial relations." It is thought too that the process of international investment can be assisted by the operation of a world bank. It is not impossible that at some future time the Bank for International Settlements will function for the settlement of the world's financial problems, as the League of Nations now functions for the settlement of political problems.

For Those Who Think

Can peace be achieved without a world organization of the nations?

What are the outstanding objectives of the League of Nations?

What obligations do the nations assume under the League?

What efforts are being made to bring the Covenant of the League and the Peace Pact of Paris into fundamental agreement with one another?

When and for what purpose was the Permanent Court of International Justice instituted?

Should the United States join the World Court? the League of Nations? Give reasons for or against such action.

CHAPTER XIII

ACHIEVING THE PEACE IDEAL

WILL we ever achieve the peace ideal? That depends upon the attitude of men and of governments. There are those who believe that the peace of the world has been realized. They read the text of the Pact of Paris and they note that the great majority of the nations have solemnly declared "that they condemn recourse to war for the solution of international controversies, and renounce it as an instrument of national policy in their relations with one another." They see too that these nations have agreed "that the settlement or solution of all disputes or conflicts of whatever nature or of whatever origin they may be, which may arise among them, shall never be sought except by pacific means."

This treaty, we are reminded, makes peace secure. Have not the nations renounced war? Yes, they have. Have not the nations agreed to settle their disputes peaceably? Yes, they have. Then what more is needed? The peril of the peace movement is hidden away in that simple question. Many people are tempted to believe that the scratching of a pen on parchment is enough to sheathe the swords of the world. That is, alas, not true. The Paris Peace Pact is a noble utterance. It is, in many respects, the most remarkable political document ever written. Idealism of a high order lies embedded in every word of that historic declaration. No other treaty is like unto it. It stands alone, not only for the simplicity of its language, but for the grandeur and nobility of its purpose. The coming into effect of the Paris Peace Pact registers the high-water mark of international morality. The Pact was boldly conceived, patiently negotiated, and prophetically proclaimed. If obeyed, in spirit and letter, the Pact will bring peace to a penitent and heartsick world.

But the Pact is only a treaty, nothing more. It is hardly that. It is nothing more than a simple statement of pur-

pose. Every word of the text is a golden word, and taken together these words deserve to be thrown across the heavens and enshrined in the thinking of every man, woman, and child of all lands and nations. The cynicism of the scoffer cannot detract from the glory of this solemn declaration. Admitting that, and more, it yet remains true that the Pact, in and of itself, cannot establish peace. Peace is not achieved so easily. If signing a treaty or a pact were all that was required, the battle flags would have been furled long ago. Peace is more elusive than that. Many additional steps will have to be taken before mankind will be ushered into the golden era of world justice and brotherhood. The Paris Peace Pact is a step, a big step, but only a step. Other steps must now be taken.

One of these steps is the speedy reduction of armaments. We have considered this problem briefly. Let it be reaffirmed, we must have disarmament, then more disarmament, and then still more disarmament. Men are likely to be deceived with the lopping off of a cruiser or a destroyer in this, that or the other navy. The reduction of the navies of the world by a few thousand tons is hardly anything to brag about, especially when it is recalled that the nations are spending more on armaments to-day than before the war. The statement that the United States, Great Britain or any other nation needs three hundred and fifty thousand tons of cruisers for defensive purposes is not true. When the pending naval conference with Great Britain and other sea powers has passed into history with the results achieved which now seem likely, and the nations have had a little time to adjust themselves to their reduced naval ratios, it will be time to hold another disarmament conference. As already indicated, another conference is being talked about for 1936. It is not to be supposed that the problem of armaments can be solved at a single sitting. Conference must follow conference until the armies and navies of the world shall have been reduced to a police basis.

All of which means that we must renounce reliance upon violence for security and justice. The idea of preparedness for war will die slowly. No political magic can with a single gesture erase from the memory of mankind the

lingering traces of the pagan philosophy that the way to insure peace is to prepare for war. Such ideas, indulged in by the responsible leaders of the people for centuries, have a strange way of persisting. They can only be combated by the no less persistent efforts of governments and of individuals to supplant the philosophy of war and war preparations with the philosophy of peace and preparations for peace. Governments simply must be made to adjust their military needs to the requirements of domestic and national police service, nothing more. This can be done only through international co-operation and the uninterrupted application of the peace ideal to the political problems of the world. This will not be done in a day, nor in several days. But a beginning can be made, and each forward step will reveal the direction in which additional steps must be taken.

Every national activity that tends to perpetuate the thought of war in the corporate thinking of every people must gradually be supplanted with endeavors consonant with the peace ideal. As long as war remained the accepted instrument of national policy preparations for war partook of a certain inevitability of procedure. Now that war has been renounced as an instrument of national policy, preparations for peace must go on with unabated zeal. To save themselves from the stigma of hypocrisy, nations must now turn their thoughts toward peace. In our own country this means the reversal of certain well-defined military policies. It means that we will have fewer, not more, military and naval academies. It means that compulsory military training in schools and colleges will become a thing of the past. It means that high-school students and undergraduates will not be obliged, against their will, to practice the use of the bayonet. It means the end of "mobilization" and "defense" days. It means that we will quit spending eighty-two cents of every dollar of our national income on war and preparation for war. It means the gradual subordination of the Navy and War Departments and the organization of a Department of Peace. Moreover, all nations are honor bound to change the fundamental premises of their respective military policies. They should in consistency with the spirit of the Pact, orient their national habits to the

requirements of an international civilization foundationed upon the attainability of peace. Conscription and all forms of compulsory military service should be abandoned. Military budgets must be pared down. Instead of preparing citizens for war governments should prepare their citizens for peace. Peace will remain an elusive abstraction until treaties to renounce war are accompanied by a progressively developed policy of multilateral disarmament.

This end will be accomplished concurrently with the attainment of national security. Governments will not disarm until they are reasonably certain that their respective peoples are immune from attack. The Peace Pact of Paris is one of the agencies guaranteeing to the nations a certain measure of security. The League of Nations, the World Court, and the Locarno Treaties, by providing for the non-violent settlement of international disputes, make still more remote the possibility of armed attack by one nation upon another. But the final and permanent achievement of the peace ideal waits upon the further development of these agencies of peace.

The World Court and the Hague Tribunal handle only those disputes that are juridical in character, whereas the most serious menace to peace involves questions political in nature. This means that agencies, such as arbitration, conciliation, mediation, and conference, must be given a larger and more inclusive area of international relations in which to function. Arbitration, having for its object "the settlement of disputes between states by judges of their own choice, and on the basis of respect for law," should be further developed until resort to it would become the chronic habit of peoples claiming to be civilized. Conciliation, on the other hand, is a procedure which aims to determine the facts in a given dispute, without any attempt at arriving at conclusions. In the language of the Hague Conference of 1907, conciliation is intended to "facilitate the solution of disputes by elucidating the facts by means of an impartial and conscientious investigation." As we have seen, the Bryan Treaties of 1913 and 1914 were "conciliation treaties," providing as they did for permanent international commissions, to which shall be referred for investigation and report "all questions of whatever char-

acter and nature . . . when diplomatic efforts fail." The Locarno Treaties of Arbitration provide that all disputes incapable of being settled by diplomatic effort may be referred to the Permanent Commission of Conciliation provided for in the treaty. The General Pan-American Treaty on Conciliation, ratified by the United States in 1929, clothes the two already existing Commissions on Conciliation with additional powers and provides for the establishment of a Commission on Inquiry with powers of initiating actions and of making constructive suggestions. This commission is competent to deal with "all controversies of any kind." There is still considerable room in international procedures for the strengthening of the instruments of conciliation.

Mediation is "reconciling the opposing claims and appeasing the feelings of resentment which may have arisen between states at variance." The opinions rendered under this procedure are not binding, and are given in the form of advice. Still another alternative for war is conference, concerning which Professor Shotwell says, "It also may investigate the issue; but since its members, unlike those of Commissions of Conciliation, include the plenipotentiaries of the disputant nations, it works toward an agreement which may be just as binding as the verdict of a court, differing from it only in the fact that the agreement is self-imposed." The point to be stressed here is that all of these forms of pacific settlement, court procedure, arbitration, conciliation, mediation, and conference, must be further developed. They must be provided with a functioning technique at once dependable and all-inclusive. Each of these forms of procedure is designed to solve a particular type of dispute, and nations must increasingly cultivate the habit of making use of these instruments of peace.

This means that international law must be codified. It is conceded that this will be a difficult task. But a start has been made. The Assembly of the League of Nations in 1924 took up the question of codification. The Council, subsequently, appointed a Committee of Experts for the Progressive Codification of International Law. This committee is now at work. In the meantime the judgments

and opinions being rendered by the World Court, and the hundreds of treaties being registered at Geneva, partake of the essence of law, thus simplifying somewhat the problem of codification. The disorganization of the world, from a legal standpoint, is being corrected, but there is still a long way to go. When that road has been traversed to the end there will be a body of law for nations as there is now a body of law for individuals.

Speaking of Departments of Peace, why shouldn't nations have such an organization in their governmental structure? Some day we will see the inconsistency of signing a Pact of Peace and of maintaining, at the same time, a Department of War. Departments and Ministries of War were created before the days of peace pacts, world courts, and arbitration treaties. To-day such departments are political and governmental anachronisms and should be supplanted by Departments and Ministries of Peace. Departments of War have been established constantly to improve military strategy and to develop the technique of military procedure. By indirection the Departments of War, of all governments, create a national state of mind suspicious of other nations. Otherwise the bottom would at once drop out of all preparations for war. Can there be any doubt but that governments should now set up Departments of Peace for the development, through international co-operation, of the technique of peaceful procedure? Since the nations have renounced war let their respective governments undertake the task of training their citizens to think in terms of peace. Why not?

Governments, as they seek to achieve the peace ideal, should definitely abandon all policies of armed intervention. This is a form of political imperialism out of tune with the spirit of the Peace Pact of Paris. Trade barriers should be removed, and the economic exploitation of one nation by another must come to an end. Shipbuilding plants and munition factories should be placed under government ownership and control. The question of taking up arms should be submitted to a popular referendum. Nations should refuse to sell arms to any government that resorts to war in violation of its pledges to maintain peace. Of even greater importance is the attitude to be assumed

by the so-called Great Powers toward subject and backward peoples. The doctrine of the "white man's burden" is a strange piece of fiction intended to justify English-speaking peoples and Europeans in their mad rush for territorial expansion and political prestige. The time has come for Western nations particularly to repent of their Pharisaic practice of lording it over the rest of the earth. They are doing that. Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, prime minister of Great Britain, in addressing the 1929 Assembly of the League of Nations, said:

"You will have seen in the press that we have offered an agreement to Egypt, the effect of which will put Egypt in a position to apply for membership in the League. The contribution we are making by this action, I think, is a very important one. If you want peace, you must remember it is not only peace between the European nations, you must get peace between France, Germany, Great Britain, Belgium, and so on. That is only going to carry us a small way, but the important, the essential part of the way.

"Yes, my friends, there are much more intricate problems bound up in the maintenance of peace than that. There is an Old World, old in civilization, old in philosophy, old in religion, old in culture, which hitherto has been weak in those material powers that have characterized the Western peoples. But that Old World, wrapped in slumber as we thought, has now become awake and is now beginning to understand that national self-respect which is taught and tutored very largely by us. It is bringing our own ideas home to us, borne by its hands, and is asking us to honor the effects of our own action and grant it, not by charity, but because our own hearts are enlightened by the freedom we have been nourishing and nurturing for ourselves for so many generations.

"The great danger of war, then, is this—that we may be too long in performing this act of recognition; that we, by our delays, by our half-heartedness, by our lack of courage, may accumulate forces in the political life of those nations that will present to us, not a request, but an ultimatum, that will make its requests in such a way that if obstacles can be placed in the way of granting them, they will be placed in the way of granting them. We say, 'Make peace

while there is still time to do it with honor and self-respect.' In that way peace will come not as a result of a challenge, but peace will come with all the glowing beneficence of a new day supplanting the old night."

When world policies are motivated by this spirit of political stewardship and of moral trusteeship we will be making progress toward achieving the peace of mankind. Meanwhile, as governments create the machinery for peace and modify their national policies in conformity with their more pacific commitments, it will be the duty of individuals to create the will to peace.

It is indeed true that "the road to the peace of the world leads through the individual." Folks aren't in the habit of looking at the peace problem in just that way. They still regard the pacification of the world as the peculiar task of the diplomat. They look to governments to do that which only individuals are able to do. Governments can build the structure of peace, but the citizens of every land must undergird these structures with a sane and healthy international mindedness.

To begin with, the individual must be well informed with respect to world problems. Zeal without knowledge is nowhere quite so fatal in its implications as in the attempted reconciliation of races and nations. Individuals have never lacked for zeal in their espousal of peace. But their zeal has been misdirected because there has been no intelligent understanding of the things that make for peace. Prayers for world comity must be backed up with facts as well as with fervor. If the peacemaker would triumph over the professional militarist, he must have a reason for the faith that is in him. The warmaker is well fortified in this respect. He can quote figures, draw charts, and talk glibly of treaties, sea power, naval bases, reserves, cruisers, garrisons, destroyers, and torpedo boats. He knows what he is doing and why he is doing it. He has an apparently inexhaustible supply of reasons for everything he does. His "white" books and his "blue" books are filled with data in support of his theories.

With the average lover of peace it is different. Thousands of people who devoutly petition Heaven for surcease from armed conflict have little knowledge of world affairs.

They have but a hazy conception of the underlying causes of war. They have, to be sure, a dread of the havoc and pestilence wrought by war. They stand aghast before the millions of graves of the world's war dead. They go into ecstasies of enthusiasm while reading poems about the brotherhood of man and the federation of the world. They are peace enthusiasts. Their concern for peace is purely emotional; it is not intellectual. They are peace-wishers, not peacemakers. And Jesus pronounced his benediction upon the makers of peace. Has not the time come, therefore, to put a little more intellectual content into our dreams for world fraternity? What do we know, for example, about the exploitation of backward peoples, about the Monroe Doctrine, about political and economic imperialism, about war debts and reparations, about the League of Nations and the World Court, about an arms embargo, about obligatory arbitration, about military training in schools and colleges? Do we know why Western nations are distrusted by the peoples of the East? Do we know about the plans for a United States of Europe? What, actually, do we know about the movement to renounce war, about the economic interdependence of nations, about disarmament and national security, about the peace time cost of war, about immigration and naturalization, about the military protection of foreign investments, about the freedom of the seas, about the Caribbean countries, the Balkans, the Near East, and Russia?

It is not to be expected that the average person will have a detailed fund of information with regard to all or any one of these world issues. This does not excuse one, however, for knowing little or nothing about these problems. There never has been a time when the news of the world has been so completely organized and made available to the general public as at the present moment. He who runs may read, provided, of course, he wants to read. More of the events of the world are being published in the newspapers to-day than in all the history of journalism. The average library has many shelves of informing books on the political, social, and economic problems of the hour. Scores of peace organizations stand ready to distribute at cost a wide range of well-written peace literature. A large

number of weekly and monthly magazines are devoted to a constructive though critical analysis of the ever-changing international situation. It is the inescapable duty of the peace protagonist to familiarize himself with the broad and underlying essentials of current world problems. Then when he fares forth as a maker of peace he will know what he is talking about.

Then, too, the lover of peace will be prepared to deny the contention that war is inevitable, that because humans have always fought they will always fight. As important as military disarmament is, mental disarmament is even more important. The first task in disarming the world mentally is to dislodge from its corporate thinking the ancient superstition that a little "blood-letting" now and then is a good thing for the race. This can only be done as individuals here and there resist the further spread of this pernicious falsehood. For centuries the makers of war have monopolized the thought life of the world. They have talked about the pugnacious instincts of humanity, about the inevitability of conflict and the futility and the barrenness of peace. The time has come to shelve these antiquated shibboleths, mumbled over and over again by the professional militarists of every nation. Von Moltke was in the habit of saying that the idea of universal peace is only a dream and not a beautiful dream either. "It is extremely improbable," says another cynic, "that the experience of future years will differ in any material respect from that which has happened since the twilight of the human race." Such is the pagan philosophy proclaimed for millenniums by chauvinistic and intriguing war lords. This skepticism regarding the attainability of peace is a challenge to those who look for the establishment of the kingdom of God upon earth. Now as never before we need millions of peace advocates who will brand the fatalistic philosophy of the militarist as a creeping falsehood and who will substitute in the place of these lies the underlying truth that God made men to live at peace with one another.

Then, too, if the individual would travel over these highways to international good will, he will practice in his own life that which he preaches for others. The place to begin

realizing the peace ideal is in one's own neighborhood. It is so easy to talk about international comity in the abstract and so difficult to infuse into our personal attitudes the spirit of brotherliness. And yet, in the last analysis, there can and will be no lasting peace until the individual has set the house of his own personal conduct in order.

The shrinking of the universe to which we have referred makes pertinent the question, Who is my brother? The races of mankind live at our very door. This is true whether we like it or not. There are approximately 821,000,000 Aryan (white) people in the world, 645,000,000 Mongolian (yellow-brown), 75,000,000 Semitic (white), 139,000,000 Negro and Bantu (black), and 28,000,000 American Indian, north and south (red and mixed). The individual maker of peace must place himself in an attitude of trustful friendship toward all these peoples. The black man on the Congo, the yellow man on the Yangste, the brown man on the Ganges, the Indian, and the Eskimo —these are our brothers. What is more, 307,000 representatives of various races and nations were admitted into the United States in 1928. Here is an opportunity for the individual to practice the spirit of peace. The obligation to live a life of brotherliness is particularly binding upon the professed followers of Jesus Christ. The story is told of a Friendly Visitor who went to call on a young Russian Jewish woman who had not been long in this country. The Visitor found the young woman homesick and despondent, despite the fact that she lived in an elegant, well-furnished apartment. Her husband, an energetic American Jew, desirous of making his wife happy in her new American environment, had rented a suite of rooms in one of the older residential sections of the city. But the young wife had had no callers. She had been utterly ignored by her Gentile neighbors. You can imagine, then, with what unrestrained joy she received the Friendly Visitor. On departing, her newly found friend said, "If you are alone and need me quickly, just call one of your neighbors and she can telephone me." With a note of loneliness in her voice the young woman replied, "There isn't anyone to call. All the people who live around here are Christians."

How can peace thrive in such an atmosphere of racial hostility? Racial snobbery delays the consummation of a righteous world order. The saving of this situation rests with individuals, not with governments. Statesmen can build the structure of peace, but this structure will fall to the ground like a house of cards if individuals persist in erecting mental barriers between races and nations. The germ of hate must be destroyed. Individuals must be united in a bond of brotherhood. Good will must be the foundation of personal contacts the world over. What can the individual do for peace? He can clear his mind of all those mental twists that make it impossible for him to see beneath the surface skin of color or beyond the horizon of his own immediate environment.

In doing these things the individual will be developing in his own life and in the life of the world a new and higher form of patriotism. He will curb the savage passions of greed, lust, and revenge that have plied their trade under the cloak of "national honor." He will interpret loyalty to his own nation in terms of a public trust. In his devotion to the land of his birth he will serve humanity. He will put his hand in the hand of the Almighty and labor with him for the coming of the day when the vision of peace has been realized.

For Those Who Think

Will we ever achieve the peace ideal?

Does the Peace Pact of Paris, standing alone, guarantee peace to the world?

What steps must be taken before peace is achieved? Reduction of armaments? The further development of the machinery for peace? The codification of international law?

Is there a place in the governmental structure of the nations for a Department or Ministry of Peace? Give reasons for and against.

How about realizing the peace ideal in one's own neighborhood? What personal attitudes must be changed before war can be uprooted?

PRAYERS FOR PEACE

"O God of nations, who through the prophets of old hast foretold the day when the armaments of war shall be beaten into the implements of peace, hasten, we beseech thee, the fulfillment of this thy most sure promise. Quell the haughty cries of the nations; clothe our nation with wisdom to counsel and courage to lead in paths of unity and peace, and speedily bring us out of our present confusion into the order and righteousness of thy kingdom; through Jesus Christ the Prince of Peace, our Saviour."

—Bishop Brent.

"O God, who by thy Son Jesus Christ has broken down the walls of partition between Jew and Gentile, slave and free, Greek and Barbarian, break down, we beseech thee, all that divides us from one another; shame our jealousies, and lay low our pride; do away with race prejudice, that the bonds of fellowship and mutual service may unite the East and West, the North and South, that we may live in peace together, in honor preferring one another; to the glory of thy great name. Amen." (Quoted from *A Quiet Room,* compiled by Rev. R. Ambrose Andrews.)

INDEX

Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium, work of, 69
Advisory Committee on Traffic in Women and Children, work of, 67
American Association of University Women, educational activities of, 23
American Federation of Labor, calls for Pan-American Federation of Labor, 47
American School Citizenship League, 30
Arbitration, beginnings of, 57; Bryan treaties, 58; new form of United States Arbitration treaties, 60; Root treaties, 58
Armaments, cause of war, 20; cost of, 114; reduction of (see Disarmament)
Bismarck, political philosophy of, 133
Bonaparte, Louis Napoleon, political theories of, 133
Briand, proposes renunciation of war treaty, 51, 60
Capital, co-operates with Labor for peace, 46
Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 22
Cavour, Count, political doctrines of, 134
Chemistry, aims of the Chemical Foundation, 88; combatting of chemical warfare, 87; description of poison gases, 86f.; effect of this science on peace movement, 86
Christian World Education, peace program of Christian Associations, 92
Christianity, conflict with militarism, 116f.; example of early Christians, 126; excommunication of war system, 128
Church, asked to bless war, 119; demarcation between state and church, 138; determination to work for peace, 145; no desire to play politics, 131, 140; position of church bodies on war, 146, 152; relation to governments, 140; right to speak out, 129f.
Codification of International Law, efforts of League, 177; recommendation of churches, 149
Commission of Inquiry on Opium Production, 70
Council, structure of Council of League of Nations, 165
Department of Peace, desirability of, 175
Diplomacy, abettor of wars, 50; the new diplomacy, 51
Disarmament, accomplishments of Washington Conference on Limitation of Armaments, 104—Geneva Conference, 107; attitude of business, 42; failure to observe provisions of Versailles Treaty, 101; Hoover-MacDonald conversations, 111; importance of mental disarmament, 182; the League and Disarmament, 103f.; need for continuous policy of, 174; present prospects, 115.
Economics, cost of World War, 33; economic restitution of

Austria and Hungary, 41; economic solidarity of mankind, 34; effect on peace of foreign investments, 37
Education, as leaven of international understanding, 21; nationalistic and divisive, 1, 19; peace education of France, 25, of Germany, Mexico, and Czechoslovakia, 26.
Essenes, nonsocial character of, 130
Exports, of United States, 34f.
Four Power Treaty, relation to disarmament question, 105
General Treaty of Inter-American Arbitration, signed by United States, 53
Geneva Disarmament Conference, convening of, 107; failure of, 107; military aspects of, 55
Geneva Protocol, negotiation and failure of, 105
Geography, effect of new geography on peace, 29
Hague Conferences, accomplishments of, 57, 161; character of, 56
Hague Court, 27f.
Hegel, theory of state, 134
History, new texts emphasizing good will, 27
Hohenzollerns, political chauvinism of, 133
Honor, former conception of national honor, 52f.
Hoover, President, calls for reduction of military budgets, 113; conversations with MacDonald, 111; disarmament efforts, 111; election of, 110; proposals for limitation of cruiser tonnage, 113
Humanitarianism, international character of social evils, 64
Ignorance, as cause of war, 31
Institute of International Education, exchange of students, 98
Intellectual co-operation, student exchanges, see League of Nations, and Education
International Advertisers' Association, 40
International Association for Promotion of Child Welfare, 68
International Chamber of Commerce, peace activities of, 39; supports World Economic Conference, 43
International Conference on White Slave Traffic, convening and purpose of, 66
International Court of Justice, establishment of, 59
International Engineers' Congress, 82
International Federation of Trade Unions, purpose of, 47
International House, purpose of, 92
International Institute of Agriculture, 40
International Labor Organization, function of, 45f.; organization of, 45f.
International Student Service, purpose and extent of, 96
International Telegraph Union, 40
Junior Red Cross, 30
Kellogg, explains limitations of Paris Peace Pact, 62
Labor, cost of war to labor, 44; effect of child labor on peace, 47; efforts for peace, 44. See International Labor Organization.

League of Nations, Article XII, 59; commitments of signatory nations, 163; Committee on Intellectual Co-operation, 24; depositing of treaties, 54; disarmament program of, 103f. health activities of, 75; humanitarian activities of, 66f.; meeting of 1929 Assembly, 164; permanent secretariat, 166; purpose of, 163; relation to Versailles Treaty, 162; repatriation of war prisoners, 74f.; settlement of various disputes, 167f.
Lindbergh, good-will flights, 80
Locarno Treaties, commitments of, 59f.; effect on disarmament, 106; parties to, 106
MacDonald, Prime Minister, treatment of subject peoples, 179; visit to United States, 101
Machiavelli, political philosophy of, 132
Mazzini, conception of state, 134
Medical research, international aspects of, 82
Militarism, conflict with Christianity, 116; fruits of, 117; waste of life, 117
Military Training, relation to Paris Peace Pact, 175
Nansen, humanitarian activities of, 74
National Student Federation, interchange of students, 78
National Study Conferences on Churches and World Peace, findings of, 146f.
Navy, cruiser parity, 112; defeat of 1927 building program, 110; growth of United States Navy, 103; opposition of churches to 1927 naval bill, 149; ordering of naval holiday, 104
Near East Relief, accomplishments of, 73
Nietzsche, hater of things Christian, 134
Opium Traffic, convening of international conference, 69f.; gradual suppression of, 69
Outlawry of war, resolution of Senator Borah, 50; [redacted] Peace Pact of Paris.
Peace Pact of Paris, churches and Pact, 150; endorsed by labor, 44; interpretations of, 62; moral limitations of, 173; need of peace machinery, 63; negotiation of, 54; new definition of national honor, 52; proclaiming of, 61; ratified by Senate, 61.
Permanent Court of Arbitration, establishment of, 161
Permanent Court of International Justice, achievements of, 169f.; election of judges, 169; nations signing optional clause, 169; relation of United States to, 170; Root formula for American adhesion, 171
Permanent Health Organization, accomplishments of, 75f.
Permanent Mandates Commission, 71
Philosophy, peace aims of, 85
Poison Gas Protocol, negotiation of, 88
Preparatory Commission for Disarmament Conference, creation of, 106; various sessions of, 108

Protocol for Pacific Settlement of International Disputes, failure of, 59
Psychology, peace aims of, 84f.
Racial variability, 1
Radio, bringing nations together, 80f.
Religion, atheism of youth, 144; Christian religion and war, 146f.; identification of church and state, 143; peace activities of non-Christian religions, 155
Rotary, International, peace objectives of, 40
Science, encircling of globe, 78f.
Sovereignty, former conception of, 51f.
Soviet Republics, disarmament proposals of, 108
State, materialistic conceptions of, 134; nature of, 131; rise and growth of nationalism, 132
Tariff, an international problem, 42; proposed world tariff holiday, 43; raising of tariff walls, 38; reduction in tariff schedules, 43
Textbooks, revamping of, 21
Traffic in Forced Labor, combatting of, 71; extent of, 71f.
Traffic in Women and Children, convention of 1910, 66; gradual suppression of, 65f.
Treitschke, political philosophy of, 133
Union of Institutes of Forestry Research, organization of, 83
Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work, peace pronouncements of, 153
Versailles, Section on League of Nations of Versailles Treaty, 162
War, uprooting psychology of, 175
War debts, 36
Washington Disarmament Conference, civilian aspects of, 55
World Community, evolution of idea of, 159f.
World Economic Conference, continuation program of, 42f.; purpose of, 41; removing economic causes of war, 41
World Engineers' Congress, 40
World Federation of Education Associations, purpose of, 23
World Friendship Among Children, work of Committee on, 26, 30
World Youth Peace Congress, convening of, 99, criticism of church, 144
World's Student Christian Federation, purpose and extent of, 95
Young, Owen D., 31
Youth, activities of European youth, 95; interracial contacts, 95; model League of Nations Assembly, 94; parley on war, 94; peace activities of, 90f; student referendums on foreign policy, 93; World Youth Peace Congress, 99

Theology Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT

953

Van Kirk, Walter William, 1891–
Highways to international good will, by Walter W. V
Kirk ... New York, Cincinnati [etc.] The Abingdon pr
[°1930]
190 p. 19[cm].

A 5982

1. Peace 1 Title.
Library of Congress JX1953.V8 30—3961
CCSC/ehw

A5982